

SUMMARY OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE: 14-25 MAY 2012

The Bonn Climate Change Conference took place from 14 to 25 May 2012 in Bonn, Germany. The conference comprised the 36th sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). It also included the 15th session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (AWG-LCA), the 17th session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) and the first session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP).

Under the SBI, key issues discussed included loss and damage, national adaptation plans (NAPs), and reporting by Annex I and non-Annex I parties. The SBSTA focused on agriculture, research and systematic observation, and methodological guidance on REDD+ (reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries). Technology and response measures were considered under both the SBI and SBSTA.

Under the AWG-KP, the focus was on issues that need to be finalized to adopt a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and for the AWG-KP to conclude its work at the eighth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 8). These include: matters relating to quantified emission limitation or reduction objectives (QELROs) with a view to adopting these as amendments to Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol and carry-over of assigned amount units (AAUs). While discussions under the AWG-KP advanced understanding of these issues, many outstanding questions remain, including the length of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol and carry-over of surplus units.

Under the AWG-LCA, parties initially debated the agenda and whether it adequately reflected progress since the adoption of the Bali Action Plan at COP 13 in 2007. After agreement on the agenda, debates continued on which issues require consideration so that the AWG-LCA can finalize its work at COP 18 in Doha.

Developed countries stressed “significant progress” and the various new institutions established in Cancun and Durban. They called for a focus on specific tasks mandated by Decision 2/CP.17 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA). Developing countries identified the need to continue discussing issues, such as finance, technology, adaptation, capacity building and response measures in order to fulfill the mandate in the Bali Action Plan.

Under the ADP, discussions centered on the agenda and election of officers. After nearly two weeks of discussions, the ADP plenary adopted the agenda and agreed on the election of officers during the final day of the conference.

At the close of the Bonn Conference, many felt that the atmosphere had been “tense,” especially under the ADP. They expressed hope that this would not have a lasting impact, putting at risk efforts to rebuild trust in the process over the past two years since Copenhagen and the “delicate balance” of interests reflected in the Durban Package.

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol	2
Report of the Meeting	2
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action	3
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol	7
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action under the Convention	9
Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice	14
Subsidiary Body for Implementation	18
A Brief Analysis of the Bonn Climate Change Conference	24
Upcoming Meetings	26
Glossary	30

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Asheline Appleton, Joanna Dafeo, Lagipoiva Chelle Jackson, Elena Kosolapova, Kati Kulovesi, Ph.D., and Eugenia Recio. The Digital Editor is Leila Mead. The Editor is Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James “Kimo” Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the European Commission (DG-ENV), the Government of the United States of America (through the Department of State Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs), the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), and the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2012 is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Australia, the Ministry of Environment of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, SWAN International, the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Japanese Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES), the Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (through the Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute – GISPRI), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Funding for translation of the *Bulletin* into French has been provided by the Government of France, the Belgium Walloon Region, the Province of Québec, and the International Organization of the Francophone (OIF and IEPF). The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD or other donors. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in non-commercial publications with appropriate academic citation. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, NY 10022, USA.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFCCC AND THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

The international political response to climate change began with the adoption of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992. The UNFCCC sets out a framework for action aimed at stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases to avoid “dangerous anthropogenic interference” with the climate system. The Convention, which entered into force on 21 March 1994, now has 195 parties.

In December 1997, delegates to COP 3 in Kyoto, Japan, agreed to a Protocol to the UNFCCC that commits industrialized countries and countries in transition to a market economy (EITs) to achieve emission reduction targets. These countries, known as Annex I parties under the UNFCCC, agreed to reduce their overall emissions of six greenhouse gases by an average of 5% below 1990 levels between 2008-2012 (the first commitment period), with specific targets varying from country to country. The Kyoto Protocol entered into force on 16 February 2005 and now has 192 parties.

LONG-TERM NEGOTIATIONS IN 2005-2009: Convening in Montreal, Canada, at the end of 2005, the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties (CMP) decided to establish the AWG-KP under Protocol Article 3.9, which mandates consideration of Annex I parties’ further commitments at least seven years before the end of the first commitment period. COP 11 created a process to consider long-term cooperation under the Convention through a series of four workshops known as “the Convention Dialogue.”

In December 2007, COP 13 and CMP 3 in Bali, Indonesia, resulted in agreement on the Bali Roadmap on long-term issues. COP 13 adopted the Bali Action Plan and established the AWG-LCA with a mandate to focus on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology and a shared vision for long-term cooperative action. Negotiations on Annex I parties’ further commitments continued under the AWG-KP. The deadline for concluding the two-track negotiations was Copenhagen in December 2009. In preparation, both AWGs held several negotiating sessions in 2008-2009.

COPENHAGEN: The UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, took place in December 2009. The high-profile event was marked by disputes over transparency and process. During the high-level segment, informal negotiations took place in a group consisting of major economies and representatives of regional and other negotiating groups. Late in the evening of 18 December, these talks resulted in a political agreement: the “Copenhagen Accord,” which was then presented to the COP plenary for adoption. Over the next 13 hours, delegates debated the Accord. Ultimately, the COP agreed to “take note” of the Copenhagen Accord. In 2010 over 140 countries indicated support for the Accord. More than 80 countries also provided information on their national mitigation targets or actions. Parties also agreed to extend the mandates of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP until COP 16 and CMP 6 in 2010.

CANCUN: Following four preparatory meetings in 2010, the UN Climate Change Conference in Cancun, Mexico, took place in December 2010. By the end of the conference, parties had finalized the Cancun Agreements, which include decisions under both negotiating tracks. Under the Convention track, Decision 1/

CP.16 recognized the need for deep cuts in global emissions in order to limit global average temperature rise to 2°C. Parties also agreed to keep the global long-term goal under regular review and consider strengthening it during a review by 2015, including in relation to a proposed 1.5°C target. They took note of emission reduction targets and nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs) communicated by developed and developing countries, respectively (FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1 and FCCC/AWGLCA/2011/INF.1, both issued after Cancun). Decision 1/CP.16 also addressed other aspects of mitigation, such as measuring, reporting and verification (MRV); reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (REDD+).

The Cancun Agreements also established several new institutions and processes, such as the Cancun Adaptation Framework and the Adaptation Committee, as well as the Technology Mechanism, which includes the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN). They also created the Green Climate Fund (GCF), designated to be a new operating entity of the Convention’s financial mechanism and governed by a Board of 24 members. Parties agreed to set up a Transitional Committee tasked with the Fund’s detailed design. Parties also established a Standing Committee to assist the COP with respect to the financial mechanism. They also recognized the commitment by developed countries to provide US\$30 billion of fast-start finance in 2010-2012, and to jointly mobilize US\$100 billion per year by 2020.

Under the Protocol track, the CMP urged Annex I parties to raise the level of ambition of their emission reduction targets with a view to achieving aggregate emission reductions consistent with the range identified in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Parties also adopted Decision 2/CMP.6 on land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF).

The mandates of the two AWGs were extended to the UN Climate Change Conference in Durban.

DURBAN: Following three negotiating sessions in 2011, the UN Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa, took place from 28 November to 11 December 2011. The Durban outcomes cover a wide range of topics, notably the establishment of a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, a decision on long-term cooperative action under the Convention, and agreement on the operationalization of the GCF. After extensive negotiations, parties also reached agreement to launch the new ADP with a mandate “to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties.” The new negotiating process is scheduled to end by 2015. The outcome is mandated for adoption at COP 21 and should come into effect and be implemented from 2020 onwards.

REPORT OF THE MEETING

The UN Climate Change Conference in Bonn opened on Monday morning, 14 May 2012. This report summarizes the discussions of the five bodies, based on their respective agendas:

- First session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP);
- 17th session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP);
- 15th session of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA).
- 36th session of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA); and
- 36th session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI).

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON THE DURBAN PLATFORM FOR ENHANCED ACTION

Opening the first session of the ADP, COP 17 President Maite Nkoana-Mashabane (South Africa) identified the new body as an opportunity to consider what needs to be done beyond 2020. She urged parties to engage constructively and create a credible work plan, prioritizing work in such a manner that the ADP can finalize its work by 2015.

Highlighting the ADP as an opportunity to demonstrate that multilateralism works, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres indicated that the ADP's work should be guided by both a short-term view that considers implementation and a long-term perspective that rises to the challenge of the post-2020 world.

Algeria, for the Group of 77 and China (G-77/China), stated that the ADP's outcome must be in line with the objective, principles and provisions of the Convention and emphasized the importance of progress under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA. She said the ADP's work plan must be based on Decision 1/CP.17 (Establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action), equity, common but differentiated responsibilities and the relevant provisions of the Convention.

Switzerland, for the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), highlighted the ADP as a turning point in the UNFCCC negotiations. He identified mitigation as the core task, involving all countries in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, while also addressing adaptation, finance, technology and capacity-building. The EIG called for a solid work plan, agreed in Bonn, that includes milestones and a timetable, leading to a smooth adoption of the future regime in 2015.

The European Union (EU) emphasized that their decision to participate in a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol was taken in the context of the wider package in Durban that leads to transition toward a single global agreement. He said a new protocol would be the most effective form of such an agreement, and identified the need to discuss how the new protocol can allow sustainable development as well as delivering the necessary emission reductions by all parties. On the mitigation work plan, the EU identified the process of closing the mitigation gap as an iterative one whereby the gap is assessed, options to increase ambition are identified and the appropriate decisions are taken.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, underscored the Durban Platform as a universal platform to take international efforts on climate change forward by providing a "common ground" for all countries. He suggested focusing the work in Bonn on defining

the ADP's work plan and added that the establishment of low-carbon development pathways is key to addressing climate change without sacrificing economic growth or development.

The Gambia, for Least Developed Countries (LDCs), highlighted that the ADP's mandate provides an opportunity to enhance the mitigation ambition and adopt a new protocol under the Convention applicable to all, taking into consideration equity and common but differentiated responsibilities. He suggested identifying deliverables for each COP in the context of a three-year programme that would allow incorporating inputs from, *inter alia*, the IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report. He underscored that the work of the ADP must not be seen as an opportunity to postpone action, and stressed the importance of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol.

Nauru, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), expressed hope that the ADP would demonstrate a "sober, serious and determined sense of urgency and ambition." She called for a mitigation work plan that makes strides in closing the recognized mitigation ambition gap.

Swaziland, for the African Group, said the ADP should result in a strengthened multilateral, rule-based climate change regime, emphasizing the need for significant scaling up of developed country mitigation ambition.

Egypt, for the Arab Group, stressed that negotiations under the ADP must ensure full and effective implementation of the Convention. He also emphasized the need to respect, and not renegotiate, the principles that govern international action.

Papua New Guinea, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, stated that an international legal instrument is needed now as 2020 is too late. She underscored the important role of REDD+ in the new regime.

India, for Brazil, South Africa, India and China (BASIC), said that the full elaboration of the ADP's work plan will only be possible after the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP have concluded their work and that an outcome should reflect the historical responsibility of developed countries and view the Durban Platform as a historic opportunity to ensure that international climate regime evolves according to the realities of a changing world.

Tajikistan, for Mountainous Landlocked Developing Countries, said a new legally-binding agreement must build upon the Convention's principles and suggested that a contact group be formed to get work underway.

Chile, for Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Peru, Panama and Dominica, said the results of the ADP should take the form of a protocol or some other legally-binding instrument under the Convention.

The Democratic Republic of Congo, for the Central Africa Forests Commission (COMIFAC), said the working group should lead to the adoption of a new binding accord and that the ADP should treat adaptation and mitigation "on equal footing."

Honduras, for the Central American Integration System (SICA), said: adaptation is the priority for the majority of developing countries, in particular for the most vulnerable ones.

Argentina, for a number of countries, emphasized that an ADP outcome should be in accordance with the Convention's principles, recognizing the different nature of developing and developed countries' obligations. He added that developing countries' voluntary NAMAs are related to the provision of

finance, technology and capacity building, and suggested that the ADP's work plan first focus on the scope of the work, including on guiding principles.

Business and Industry NGOs suggested strengthening the avenues for the business and private sector to contribute to the ADP's work in areas such as finance, innovation, MRV, and new market mechanisms.

Climate Action Network (CAN), for Environmental NGOs, urged: increasing mitigation ambition through, *inter alia*, closing loopholes, eliminating fossil fuel subsidies and adopting an ADP work plan with milestones.

ICLEI, for Local Government and Municipal Authorities, underscored that there is a "dangerous gap" between now and 2020 that needs to be addressed by increasing mitigation ambition. He highlighted the key role of local governments in successfully implementing climate change policies.

Women and Gender Constituency cautioned against exacerbating gender inequalities and identified the need to integrate human and social dimensions into the climate change negotiations. She suggested a workshop on gender equality.

Youth NGOs (YOUNGOs) said: the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities is not negotiable; the integrity of the Convention should not be undermined; and closing the ambition gap should be a priority for the ADP.

ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS: Discussions during ADP 1 focused on the election of officers and the agenda. Agreement on these two issues took time and was only reached during the ADP closing plenary on 25 May.

Election of Officers: In the ADP plenary on Thursday, 17 May, COP Vice-President Robert Van Lierop (Suriname) explained that intensive consultations have taken place before and during the Bonn meeting concerning the ADP Bureau. He noted that it remains unresolved and urged parties to agree on nominees for the Chair and Vice-Chair so that the ADP can begin its work. The three candidates for ADP Chair were Harald Dovland (Norway), nominated by the Western Europe and Others Group, Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago), nominated by the Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC) and Jayant Moreshwar Mauskar (India), nominated by the Asia-Pacific Group. A proposal was made to elect the Chair at this session and continue consultations on the election of other officers until Doha. Delegates were given until Friday, 18 May to consult on this proposal.

On 18 May, the ADP reconvened. COP Vice-President Van Lierop explained that consultations on the election of the ADP Bureau by Amb. Nozipho Joyce Mxakato-Diseko (South Africa) had been inconclusive. Amb. Diseko raised the possibility of the ADP Bureau being elected by a vote in accordance with the draft rules of procedure.

Expressing regret for the situation, The Gambia, for LDCs, supported by Guyana, for GRULAC, the EU, the US, Australia, AOSIS and the Russian Federation, proposed that the COP Presidency preside over the ADP until matters concerning the election of its Bureau are resolved. Parties agreed that the COP President would preside during the Bonn session, while consultations continued on the election of officers.

On Saturday, 19 May, COP Vice-President Van Lierop informed the ADP plenary that the COP 17 President had designated Sandea de Wet (South Africa) to preside over the

ADP on her behalf and urged parties to intensify their efforts in informal consultations facilitated by Amb. Diseko so that the ADP Bureau can be elected by the end of the Bonn session.

Informal consultations on the ADP Bureau continued throughout the meeting. On the morning of Friday, 25 May, Amb. Diseko reported that the consultations had been "intensive" and that they revealed parties strong interest and commitment to the work of the ADP. She explained there was agreement on the principles of equitable and geographical balance, rotation between Annex I and non-Annex I parties and regional rotation in 2012-2015. She noted that despite all efforts there was no successful outcome and described this as a "sad state of affairs." She requested parties to prepare for elections in accordance with the draft rules of procedure. The EU, supported by Saudi Arabia, requested an adjournment to allow for further consultations among the regional groups. The ADP plenary was suspended for further informal consultations.

In the evening, Amb. Diseko reported that agreement had been reached. She outlined an interim arrangement, which will be applied pending its endorsement by COP 18. The arrangement consists of a multi-year approach for the Bureau, with two Co-Chairs, one from a non-Annex I country and one from an Annex I country. In 2012-2013, the ADP will be co-chaired by Mauskar and Dovland. Oleg Shamanov (Russian Federation) will be the Rapporteur. In 2013, Kumarsingh will co-chair the ADP with a Co-Chair from an Annex I country, and the Rapporteur will come from a non-Annex I party. In 2015, the non-Annex I party Co-Chair will be from the African Group and the Rapporteur from a non-Annex I country. Amb. Diseko commended the ADP's achievement, underscoring the need for "the spirit of unity" and called for keeping transparency and mutual trust among parties.

UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres welcomed the new Bureau members and commended de Wet and the COP presidency for having "unequivocal perseverance" in taking forward the negotiations on the agenda and the Bureau officers. She highlighted the need to keep working in a spirit of mutual respect and congratulated parties for "having taken the first of many footsteps of this journey."

ADP Co-Chair Mauskar highlighted that the Durban package of decisions is a landmark and, in that context, the ADP is significant, in establishing a new process. He acknowledged that taking the process forward to achieve meaningful results at Doha and beyond will be complex and challenging. He said that the ADP Co-Chairs will undertake intersessional consultations on how parties intend to progress on the two work streams under the ADP agenda.

Agenda and organization of work: The ADP agenda was first considered on Saturday, 19 May when interim Chair de Wet proposed that the ADP plenary adopts the agenda (FCCC/ADP/2012/1).

China requested the Secretariat to explain the rationale of the items on the ADP's provisional agenda. The Secretariat responded that items 3 (planning of work in accordance with Decision 1/CP.17) and 4 (work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition) were placed on the provisional agenda on the basis of Decision 1/CP.17.

China stated that Decision 1/CP.17 does not specify that the work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition should be under

the ADP. He emphasized a post-2020 outlook as the ADP's core task, and also noted that raising the level of ambition does not only refer to mitigation but also to means of implementation in technology, finance and capacity building. China suggested deleting item 4 and amending item 3 to "planning of the work on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, transparency of action and support, and capacity building." Singapore cautioned against listing specific issues to avoid potential exclusion of those not listed. He suggested that item 3 be adopted as proposed, while item 4 on the work plan on mitigation ambition be amended by adding "in accordance with Decision 1/CP.17."

Nauru, for AOSIS, The Gambia, for LDCs, Barbados, Grenada, Switzerland, the EU, the US, Mexico, Singapore, Australia, Japan and Costa Rica urged the adoption of the agenda as originally proposed. The EU stressed that the work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition was a core element of the Durban package. Barbados explained that a draft decision had been proposed in Durban that included only a post-2020 outlook but the most vulnerable countries had rejected this proposal. He suggested modifying item 4 by adding a reference to "pre-2020 mitigation ambition." Many parties emphasized the need to adopt the agenda and begin substantive work as soon as possible, including on pre-2020 mitigation ambition.

Brazil recognized that the work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition is part of the agreement on the ADP, highlighting that discussions around this issue will be broader than a simple reference to mitigation. He stressed that the main focus of the ADP's work will be on negotiations for the new instrument and that the two elements of its work will be separate.

The Philippines, supported by several parties, proposed deleting item 4 and amending item 3 to "planning of work in accordance with all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17." Grenada, the EU, Barbados and others opposed this proposal. With Switzerland and others, they reiterated their support for adopting the agenda as originally proposed by the Chair.

Venezuela noted her country's formal reservation to Decision 1/CP.17 in Durban and highlighted that developed countries had already "violated" the Durban package by not putting on the table their QELROs for the second commitment period under the Protocol. Supported by Bolivia, she requested adding a footnote to the agenda to indicate that: "the implementation of Decision 1/CP.17 should be examined on the basis of its compliance with international law, in accordance with the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* and, in particular, with the exception on non-performance related to the full respect and compliance with the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol, for the parties that are parties of those instruments." Venezuela stressed that the footnote is "indispensable" for her country's support for the adoption of the agenda. The US, Singapore and Switzerland preferred not including a footnote.

Interim Chair de Wet stressed that the Durban outcome was "a very balanced one," saying it will be difficult to delete agenda items. She urged parties to adopt the agenda as originally proposed, thereby sending "a tremendous" message to the international community that parties are ready to begin work under the ADP.

The Philippines, supported by Ecuador, Bolivia, Malaysia, Argentina, Iran, China and others, opposed this. After further

discussion, interim Chair de Wet proposed launching substantive work provisionally on the basis of the proposed agenda while conducting informal consultations on the agenda.

Reconvening the ADP plenary on Tuesday, 22 May, interim Chair de Wet invited parties to share their views on how they see work proceeding under the ADP.

Venezuela, speaking on behalf of Argentina, Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Palestine, Paraguay, the Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen, expressed willingness to discuss a post-2020 mitigation framework, while recognizing the need to enhance mitigation actions in 2012-2020. He also pointed out that a separate agenda item on enhancing mitigation ambition under the ADP would "render meaningless" the ongoing discussions under the AWGs. He expressed support for an inclusive agenda that captures, in a non-selective manner, all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17.

A number of parties highlighted the key elements of the Durban package and called for launching the ADP's work as agreed in Durban. They expressed concern over efforts to "undo" the Durban package and delay progress. The EU, supported by Norway, highlighted the "fine and balanced" Durban compromise, consisting of: a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol; a pre-2020 mitigation work plan; agreement by 2015 applicable to all; concluding the AWG-LCA; and operationalizing the institutions created in Cancun and Durban. He underscored that ministers noted the ambition gap in Durban "with great concern" but it is not for negotiators to change the agreement. The EU also expressed concern over attempts to change the ADP's mandate to negotiate a new, legally-binding instrument applicable to all by introducing the Bali Action Plan into the new mandate. He urged agreement on the ADP agenda and said work should be launched under two contact groups.

Switzerland, for the EIG, warned that attempting to change the balanced Durban package will put Doha at risk. Chile highlighted that the Durban Platform has "transformative potential, and presents opportunities to increase the ambition that must be seized." With many others, he listed key elements of the Durban package, including: a second Protocol commitment period to commence in January 2013; a new legally binding agreement, concluded as early as possible but no later than 2015, in order to take effect no later than 2020; a work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition with a view to closing the ambition gap and reach an emissions trajectory consistent with the goal of limiting temperature increase to below 2°C; and the successful completion of the AWG-LCA's work at COP 18. Chile elaborated that the new agreement should include mitigation commitments by all parties, finance commitments, adaptation, technology development and transfer, transparency of action, and support and capacity building.

Australia highlighted two distinct work streams under the ADP on: the development of a protocol or legally-binding agreement; and enhancing mitigation ambition. He suggested using 2012 as a "conceptual year" aimed at sharing ideas on the work of the ADP. Proposing the adoption of the ADP agenda based on what was agreed to in Durban, Nauru, for

AOSIS, called for a detailed schedule of work with timetables and milestones. He underscored the need for a work plan for enhancing mitigation ambition. Colombia proposed establishing two contact groups on agenda items 3 and 4. The Marshall Islands emphasized the decision by ministers in Durban to launch the mitigation work plan.

The US identified “critically important” features in the Durban Platform, highlighting an instrument with legal force for all parties and a path leading further into the future than before. He underscored two work streams with a clear mandate from the COP: developing a post-2020 regime and working on pre-2020 mitigation. Emphasizing the need to implement rather than renegotiate Decision 1/CP.17, he called for planning the ADP’s work at this meeting, including input and interactions over the coming months.

Brazil emphasized the importance of advancing all aspects of the Durban outcome and highlighted the main focus of the Durban Platform to create a new legal instrument under the UNFCCC as “an important opportunity that must not be lost.” South Africa underscored the importance of trust and mutual reassurance, upon which the Durban Package was based, including agreement to look at the level of ambition.

The Russian Federation highlighted a new, comprehensive agreement as the main objective of the ADP’s work and warned against using the agenda as a tool to review the “fragile and multifaceted” balance of interests agreed in Durban. Stressing urgency, Japan warned against wasting time on agenda discussions and called for starting substantive work in contact groups. New Zealand expressed concern over the “difficult atmosphere” and attempts to renegotiate ministerial agreements. She stressed that the agenda must be compatible with the Durban outcome, and proposed establishing two contact groups. Norway urged agreement on the agenda and Chairs, calling for discussions on the ADP work programme and milestones. He underscored that work must start under both work streams. Canada supported working through two groups, which would make progress possible in the discussions to raise the level of ambition and arrive at a “single, global and comprehensive agreement” for all parties.

India underscored the importance of working on, *inter alia*, mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, and ensuring that the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities are “fully suffused” in each item. He also recalled that ambition relates to all elements of work. China emphasized the need to continue work under the AWG-LCA, according to the Bali Action Plan. He urged continued work on mitigation ambition under the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA.

The ADP plenary reconvened on Friday, 25 May. Interim Chair de Wet explained that she had undertaken extensive consultations on the agenda. She said the discussions had provided clarity on the future and for the organization of work. She thanked parties for their hard work, active participation, flexibility and understanding and invited them to adopt the agenda.

Venezuela noted that the footnote requested by his country regarding reassurances had not been reflected in the revised agenda. He asked for the footnote to be reflected either in a miscellaneous document or in the agenda. Interim Chair de

Wet responded that her understanding was that Venezuela’s concerns had been addressed during informal discussions and that Venezuela’s request would be reflected in the report of the session. Parties agreed to reflect the footnote in a miscellaneous document and in the meeting’s report.

Parties then adopted the agenda as revised during informal consultations (FCCC/ADP/2012/L.1). The revised agenda contains item 3 (implementation of all the elements of Decision 1/CP.17), with paragraph (a) on “matters related to paragraphs 2 to 6” and paragraph (b) on “matters related to paragraphs 7 and 8.” Item 3 also includes a footnote explaining that the item “will be considered within the context of Decision 1/CP.17 and under the Convention, without prejudice to the position of any Party or to the work of the other Subsidiary Bodies.” The footnote also indicates that two work streams are initiated under paragraphs (a) and (b), and further work streams may be considered as the need arises.

ADP WORKSHOP: On Friday, 18 May, an ADP workshop took place under the title “Workshop to increase the level of ambition on paragraph 8 of Decision 1/CP.17.” For detailed coverage of the workshop, see <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12542e.html>.

CLOSING PLENARY: The ADP closing plenary took place on Friday, 25 May. Parties adopted the meeting’s report (FCCC/ADP/2012/L.2).

Saudi Arabia, for the Asia-Pacific Group, said that electing the ADP Bureau by a vote would have had serious consequences for the UNFCCC process and highlighted the importance of preserving consensus.

The Gambia, for LDCs, called for a meeting before Doha to advance the ADP’s work and avoiding lengthy discussion on the organization of work.

Nauru, for AOSIS, highlighted that policy decisions should be guided by science, and success will only be reached by working together. On the post-2020 period, he supported milestones and deadlines for smooth and steady progress by 2015. He supported submissions on the planning of work and on identifying ways to close the ambition gap. He said a work plan should focus on, *inter alia*: developed countries’ information on policies to increase the level of ambition; developing countries’ analysis of their mitigation potential and means of implementation needed; and developed countries’ information on potential scale up of support for enabling ambitious NAMAs.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, said the ADP should intensify global cooperation on climate change to meet the below 2°C goal. He called for progress on the two tasks: enhancing pre-2020 mitigation ambition and negotiating a new legal agreement applicable to all.

Swaziland, for the African Group, expressed hope for work under the ADP to provide an opportunity for a fair, multilateral, rules-based system in the context and principles of the Convention. He expressed disappointment that some parties have “pushed back” on assurances given in Durban with regard to the second commitment period under the Protocol, and also that the comparability assurance from developed countries had not been realized. He called for an increase in the level of ambition on all fronts, including through the scale-up of finance, technology transfer, and focused capacity building towards developing countries for mitigation and adaptation.

The EU expressed support for adopting a ratifiable second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol in Doha as part of a transition to a single, comprehensive and global legally binding climate agreement by 2020. He also stated the need to take forward the pre-2020 mitigation work plan as agreed to in Durban. He proposed that workshops be held to take forward the two substantive work streams covered by the agenda in the ADP: one on a work plan taking parties towards the 2015 agreement, and the other on ways to enhance pre-2020 mitigation ambition.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, expressed hope that the work under the ADP will lead to concrete and positive outcomes for all parties, in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention.

Mexico, for the EIG, described the Durban package as a turning point in the climate negotiations, noting that substantive work must start in the next session on both work streams to increase mitigation ambition and adopt a legal instrument under the Convention that is applicable to all parties.

Guyana, for GRULAC, congratulated the Chairs and Rapporteur of the ADP on their election, adding that they were “pleased” to be part of the leadership of the ADP, and offered the support and cooperation of GRULAC.

Venezuela, for the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA), reiterated the need for developed countries to fulfill their ambitions in reducing emissions, highlighting the efforts of developing countries in reducing emissions. He said that parties need to avoid artificial splits between working groups as this threatens the principle of equity based on common but differentiated responsibilities. He referred to the ADP as the “new ship of hope.”

Slovenia, for Central and Eastern European countries, congratulated the new leadership and expressed hope on the success of the work of the ADP.

Egypt, for the Arab Group, noted that the ADP work programme must be based on clear agreement and understanding on guidelines in accordance with all the articles and principles of the Convention.

The Philippines, on behalf of a group of 38 countries, indicated that all elements of Decision1/CP.17 form part of the ADP’s work, noting that the organization of the work must reflect this as well as the principles and provisions of the Convention. She observed that the legal form of the outcome should not be decided up-front, nor should discussions on this be an immediate priority.

Honduras, for SICA, reaffirmed adaptation as the main priority, requesting serious advancement during the next negotiating session to ensure actions and results that favor reduction of vulnerability in their region.

Sierra Leone, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, stated that a new, international agreement is needed before 2020. He underscored the need for REDD+ mechanisms to be part of the new regime, and for private and public capital to make REDD+ phases effective.

Tajikistan, for Mountainous Landlocked Developing Countries, called for, *inter alia*: a work plan with “uncomplicated and inclusive institutional arrangements,” with clear milestones. He underscored the need for a new legal agreement

to acknowledge the wide range of climate vulnerabilities developing countries face and to provide long-term financial support to vulnerable developing countries.

ADP Co-Chair Mauskar suspended the ADP at 8:21 pm.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON FURTHER COMMITMENTS FOR ANNEX I PARTIES UNDER THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

The AWG-KP opening plenary took place on Monday, 15 May, with Madeleine Diouf (Senegal) as the AWG-KP Chair and Jukka Uosukainen (Finland) as the AWG-KP Vice-Chair.

Chair Diouf highlighted important outcomes from CMP 7 and called on parties to build on the momentum to finalize the AWG-KP’s work for adoption by CMP 8 in Doha. Parties adopted the agenda and agreed to the organization of work (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/1 and 2).

ANNEX I FURTHER COMMITMENTS: Chair Diouf recalled the AWG-KP’s mandate to conclude its work by CMP 8 and identified issues for consideration to fulfill its mandate. These include QELROs (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/MISC.1 and Add.1), carry-over of AAUs and proposed amendments to the Protocol, including the length of the second commitment period.

Parties agreed to establish a contact group on Annex I further commitments, co-chaired by Chair Diouf and Vice-Chair Uosukainen. A spin-off group was subsequently created, focusing on numbers and text. It was co-facilitated by Jürgen Lefevere (EU) and Sandea de Wet (South Africa), later replaced by Harald Winkler (South Africa), following de Wet’s appointment as the interim ADP Chair. Legal and procedural issues were considered in informal consultations facilitated by Vice-Chair Uosukainen.

Numbers/Text: On this issue (FCCC/KP/AWG/2012/MISC.1 and Add.1), parties considered a number of proposals, and *inter alia*: heard presentations on the parties’ QELROs submissions; discussed the level of ambition of parties’ commitments and carry-over of surplus AAUs; and reviewed options for addressing the carry-over of surplus AAUs from the first to the second commitment period.

On **QELROs**, parties received information from Switzerland, Norway, Kazakhstan, the EU, AOSIS, Belarus, Australia, and Croatia regarding, *inter alia*: clarifications on QELROs submissions and associated conditions; views on market mechanisms; national policies implemented to support QELROs; and preferences for the length of the second commitment period.

On **ambition**, the EU introduced two proposals. The first one would establish a review of the level of ambition of parties’ QELROs, coinciding with the 2013-2015 Review under the Convention, to address the concern raised by some parties that an eight-year commitment period would lock in a low level of ambition. The second one includes a simplified procedure to amend Protocol Annex B to facilitate an increase in the level of ambition by parties.

Brazil introduced a proposal on revising QELROs with a view to strengthening commitments under the Protocol. The proposal indicates that Annex I parties may, at any time, strengthen their QELROs and ensure the immediate effect of such revision by: forfeiting a part of their AAUs; transferring these units to a cancellation account established for this purpose in the national registry; and communicating such transfer to the Secretariat.

On *carry-over of surplus AAUs*, the African Group, AOSIS, and Brazil offered proposals and presentations. The African Group proposal states, *inter alia*, that surplus AAUs can be carried over but placed in a special reserve, provided that the party is participating in the second commitment period and the party's QELRO is lower than its 2008 greenhouse gas inventory. In addition, the proposal permits parties to trade 2% of the reserve per year with 1% of the revenue to be spent on domestic mitigation and 1% of AAUs to be transferred to the Adaptation Fund.

The AOSIS proposal states that, *inter alia*, the total quantity of AAUs, Certified Emission Reductions and Emission Reduction Units approved for carry-over, and carried over from the previous commitment period, shall be deemed a party's previous period surplus reserve. It also states that after the end of the subsequent commitment period, a party may use any carried over units up to a specified quantity.

The Brazilian proposal contains various paragraphs, which state that, *inter alia*, if the emissions of an Annex I party in a commitment period are less than its assigned amount under this article, the difference shall, on request of that party, be carried over to the subsequent commitment period. It alternatively states that if the assigned amount of an Annex I party included for the first commitment period is less than that party's emissions in 2007 multiplied by five, the difference between the assigned amount for that party for the first commitment period and its emissions in 2012 multiplied by five shall be deemed the previous period surplus reserve.

Legal issues: During informal consultations facilitated by Vice-Chair Uosukainen, parties considered legal aspects of the entry into force of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol. Issues discussed included: how to secure continuity between the first and second commitment periods; the application of accounting rules in the second commitment period; options for provisional application of Protocol amendments to secure continuity pending their entry into force; and ways to raise ambition levels during the second commitment period.

Parties also considered an AOSIS proposal relating to provisional application of the Protocol amendment, an AOSIS proposal for amendments and an African Groups proposal on legal issues. Many parties stressed the need for clarity on legal issues to ensure a "seamless continuation" of the Protocol beyond 2012. Enhanced clarity on parties' positions was noted, as well as "a large amount" of work remaining before a successful outcome in Doha can be reached.

CLOSING PLENARY: The AWG-KP closing plenary convened on Thursday, 24 May. Chair Diouf indicated that discussions in the AWG-KP contact group have advanced understanding of substantive issues. She identified issues for further consideration, including information on QELROs; carry-over of AAUs; and proposed amendments to the Kyoto Protocol, including the length of the second commitment period. On informal consultations on legal and procedural issues related to the second commitment period, she highlighted enhanced clarity on parties' positions and on the options to facilitate a successful outcome in Doha, noting that "a large amount" of work remains.

Chair Diouf suggested suspending AWG-KP 17 and resuming work at the next meeting, saying this will allow the AWG-KP to proceed promptly with the current organization of work. Parties

agreed to the proposal. Chair Diouf also noted wide support for an additional session before Doha, explaining that this depends on funding.

Swaziland, for the African Group, highlighted, *inter alia*, that: the legal status of the second commitment period is not negotiable; a five-year commitment period is needed to avoid locking in low levels of ambition; and that not all Annex I parties have submitted adequate, or any, information on QELROs. He highlighted the African Group's proposal on carry-over of units, saying it gives "fair reward" to over-achievement, maintains environmental integrity and is flexible enough to cater for countries with special needs. He also noted monetization of AAUs to capitalize the Adaptation Fund.

The Republic of Korea, for the EIG, emphasized commitment to adopting amendments to the Protocol in Doha with a view to operationalize the second commitment period. He highlighted, *inter alia*, that: the length of the second commitment period should be eight years; the mid-term review to enhance the level of ambition has to be conducted in the context of the scientific recommendations of the IPCC; and agreement is needed on an environmentally integral treatment of carry-over.

Nauru, for AOSIS, identified the need to address surplus Kyoto units, highlighting the proposals by AOSIS and others to move this issue forward. He called for clear, unconditional, single-number QELROs for a five-year commitment period and clarifying that units from any new market mechanism under the Convention may only be used within the Kyoto accounting framework if they have been scrutinized for environmental integrity. He stressed that Protocol amendments adopted in Doha must be legally-binding on parties from 1 January 2013 onwards through the provisional application of these amendments pending their entry into force.

The EU highlighted the importance of transition and continuity of rules, institutions and mechanisms. He lamented the lack of agreement on the length of the second commitment period, and reiterated support for an eight-year period. He urged other Annex B parties that have not done so to provide information on their QELROs. He called for "the Durban constructive spirit" to take the final steps for a second commitment period in Doha as part of progress across all tracks on the road to a single global and comprehensive legally-binding agreement.

The Gambia, for LDCs, urged those Annex I parties that have not done so to submit their QELROs. He supported: a five-year commitment period to avoid locking in the current low level of ambition for eight years; having a cap on carry-over of AAUs; and the provisional application of the proposed Protocol amendments for the second commitment period. He called for: avoiding the "distractions" by parties wanting to "jump ship"; clearing away the conditionalities; and striving for continuity.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, called for ensuring the smooth operation of the second commitment period, to commence on 1 January 2013, as well as securing a smooth post-2012 transition for the flexibility mechanisms. He welcomed the "breakthrough" in Durban to negotiate a new, comprehensive agreement by 2015 covering all parties, recognizing the Kyoto Protocol's role in securing the Durban outcome. He emphasized

that alone, a second commitment period “cannot help us avoid dangerous climate change” and that “it will be only one part of the bigger picture.”

Saudi Arabia, for the Arab Group, expressed disappointment with the slow pace of negotiations on key issues, in particular on the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. Underscoring historical responsibility, he said, *inter alia*, that: emission reductions are the primary responsibility of developed countries; negotiations under the AWG-KP should be separated from other negotiations; and the flexibility mechanisms should only benefit parties undertaking commitments during the second commitment period.

Ecuador, for ALBA, expressed concern with the lack of fulfillment of the legal mandate to achieve ambitious emission reductions. He said the level of ambition by developed countries is insufficient. He maintained that a central element of the Doha package must be a legal procedure for countries who did not comply with their obligations under the Kyoto Protocol. He underscored that the ADP should not jeopardize progress under the AWG-KP.

Sierra Leone, for a number of members of the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, expressed preference for a five-year commitment period that would better enable considering new scientific results, and highlighted the need for clear rules to ensure environmental integrity. He emphasized a link between the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA concerning units from the new market mechanism. He stressed the role of REDD+ in the new market mechanism, highlighting public and private capital, and ambitious Annex I commitments.

Honduras, for SICA, expressed deep concern over delays concerning the second commitment period under the Protocol, stressing the need for urgent progress. He expressed support for a five-year commitment period.

Thanking delegates, AWG-KP Chair Diouf suspended AWG-KP 17 at 5:58 pm.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON LONG-TERM COOPERATIVE ACTION UNDER THE CONVENTION

Opening the session on Tuesday, 15 May, AWG-LCA Chair Aysar Tayeb (Saudi Arabia) recalled the mandate to finish the AWG-LCA’s work at COP 18. On the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/1), he outlined intentions to establish a single contact group. He also noted that five in-session workshops will take place, as mandated by Decision 2/CP.17 (Outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA).

Discussions ensued on the AWG-LCA’s proposed agenda and organization of work. China, Bolivia, Venezuela and Nicaragua expressed support for adopting the agenda as proposed. The EU lamented that the proposed agenda did not recognize specific issues that the AWG-LCA was tasked by COP 17 to take forward in 2012. He emphasized that listing the elements of the Bali Action Plan in the agenda implied that no progress had been made since COP 13. He specified that the agenda did not take into account the various new institutions created or that some of the issues had been transferred from the AWG-LCA to the SBI and SBSTA. Switzerland, for the EIG, called for clarity on the organization of work, noting that many of the items on the proposed agenda had already been addressed. The US, supported by Canada and others, expressed concern with reopening of

issues and proposed establishing spin-off groups to consider issues specifically mandated by COP 17. Chair Tayeb noted that issues on the proposed agenda have enjoyed different levels of progress and listing them on the agenda did not imply that they were going to be reopened.

Informal consultations on the agenda followed. On Thursday, 17 May, Chair Tayeb reported to the plenary that agreement had been reached on the agenda, with a footnote stating that items on the agenda enjoy different levels of progress through decisions adopted by COP 16 and COP 17, and some items may not need further work under the AWG-LCA taking into account the progress made. He also noted agreement to proceed in the single contact group; rapidly launch spin-off groups to consider tasks mandated in Durban; and evaluate progress through the single contact group to decide where additional spin-off groups are needed. Chair Tayeb also said he will consult informally on Annex I parties whose special circumstances have been recognized by the COP.

Parties then adopted the revised agenda (FCCC/AWGLCA/2012/L.1) and agreed to establish a single AWG-LCA contact group, chaired by Tayeb.

AGENDA ITEMS 3, 4 AND 5: Discussions in the AWG-LCA contact group focused on agenda items 3 (preparation of an agreed, comprehensive and balanced outcome to COP 18), 4 (review) and 5 (other matters).

At the first contact group meeting on Friday, 18 May, parties debated whether spin-off groups would only focus on the implementation of tasks mandated by COP 17. Agreement was reached to launch spin-off groups on tasks mandated by COP 17, including on: shared vision; developed country mitigation; developing country mitigation; REDD+; sectoral approaches; various approaches, including markets; and Review.

Progress made under the AWG-LCA since the adoption of the Bali Action Plan and the need for additional spin-off groups was debated during subsequent contact group meetings. Many developing countries called for spin-off groups on adaptation, finance, technology and response measures, underscoring outstanding issues. Developed countries opposed, highlighting progress made under the AWG-LCA and establishment of various new institutions and processes. Belarus, for Kazakhstan, Ukraine and the Russian Federation, supported a spin-off group on other matters and EITs.

At the AWG-LCA closing plenary on Thursday, 24 May, Chair Tayeb said discussions in the AWG-LCA contact group had been helpful in furthering parties’ understanding of each other’s views. Parties agreed that the oral reports and summaries of the issues discussed under the contact group will be made available online and can be used in future discussions, but they have no formal status. The reports can be accessed at: http://unfccc.int/meetings/bonn_may_2012/session/6646.php.

Discussions on issues under the AWG-LCA contact group are summarized below under the respective agenda items and sub-items.

PREPARATION OF AN AGREED COMPREHENSIVE AND BALANCED OUTCOME FOR COP 18: Shared

Vision: Discussions in the informal group on shared vision, facilitated by Zou Ji (China), focused on identifying possible areas of convergence.

Botswana, for the African Group, Uganda, for LDCs, China, Brazil and others stressed the importance of the means of implementation. Some developing countries urged for a discussion on the context, whereas several developed countries said the focus should be on the global goal for emission reductions and timeframe for peaking. China, supported by Brazil, requested that the importance of context be included in the Facilitator's report. Mexico, the Philippines and others said that relevant contextual elements need to be defined. Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, said that burden-sharing cannot be discussed without identifying the burden first. While many parties supported discussion of the context for identifying the goals, their views differed on the context. Some parties suggested the principle of equity is key for considering, *inter alia*: contributions, capabilities and circumstances. Some developing countries drew attention to trade, response measures and intellectual property rights (IPRs) as potential elements within the context.

In the final AWG-LCA contact group meeting, three options were identified for consideration: specific numbers for goals with context; range of numbers for goals with context; or process or mechanism with which to work on a specific number or range of numbers for goals. Facilitator Ji underscored the AWG-LCA workshop on equitable access to sustainable development as a good opportunity to exchange views. Among key issues, he highlighted discussions on context for equity and equitable access to sustainable development; definition of equity; and application of the equity principle. For more details on the workshop, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12538e.html>.

Mitigation: Developed country mitigation: Developed country mitigation was considered in a spin-off group and an in-session workshop.

The workshop on clarification of developed country parties' quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets and related assumptions and conditions took place on Thursday, 17 May. For more details on the workshop, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12539e.html>.

On Tuesday, 22 May, the spin-off group on mitigation by developed country parties convened for the first time, facilitated by Andrej Kranjc (Slovenia).

The EU, Norway, the US, Japan and other developed countries identified the ADP as the appropriate place for discussing mitigation ambition. India highlighted that discussions should be based on the Bali Action Plan, which mandates comparable efforts among developed countries. Ecuador underscored that the AWG-LCA should not conclude its work before the Bali Action Plan mandate on developed country mitigation has been fulfilled.

A number of developed countries highlighted the agreement to terminate the work of the AWG-LCA in Doha. Many developing countries supported further work on common accounting rules, with South Africa calling for considering comparability and compliance. Parties also suggested that the group focus on further clarifying assumptions underlying developed country pledges. China indicated that progress on comparability of developed countries' mitigation efforts is required, otherwise the Bali Action Plan mandate will not be accomplished and the AWG-LCA will not be able to terminate its work at Doha. India suggested the group elaborate a robust set of rules on

accountability and enhancement of mitigation ambition. Many developed countries supported an updated technical paper and further workshops on understanding underlying assumptions.

In the final AWG-LCA contact group meeting on 24 May, Facilitator Kranjc reported on substantive issues and suggestions for the way forward. On substantive issues, he noted, *inter alia*: that all parties agreed to the continuation of the process to clarify developed country parties' quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets is essential to enable the understanding of various issues, such as assumptions and conditions associated with the targets. He also noted a number of divergent views around issues related to, *inter alia*: the comparability of efforts by all developed country parties as outlined in the Bali Action Plan and whether the ambition gap should be addressed in the AWG-LCA, ADP, or other bodies under the Convention.

On the way forward, the group agreed, *inter alia*: to continue working on the clarification of targets in workshops, but in a more rigorous way and on the usefulness of updating the technical paper (FCCC/TP/2012/2) to incorporate additional information provided by parties. Divergent views were reported on the following: whether the update of the technical paper should be preceded by further submissions from developed country parties in the form of an agreed and updated common template; and on the next steps in and after Doha, including if the process of clarifying targets should continue, and if specific work should be carried out under the subsidiary bodies (SBs).

Developing country mitigation: Developing country mitigation was considered in a spin-off group and an in-session workshop.

The workshop to further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs by developing country parties, underlying assumptions, and any support needed for implementation of these actions took place on Friday, 18 May. For more details on the workshop, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12540e.html>.

The spin-off group was facilitated by Gary Theseira (Malaysia). It discussed the tasks mandated by Decision 2/CP.17. There were divergent views on how to take the work forward and three options were considered, namely:

- the organization of a workshop to further the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs, structured around the elements identified in Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 34, including assumptions and methodologies, sectors and greenhouse gases, support needs and others;
- that the Secretariat prepare a synthesis report or compilation paper gathering the information provided by developing country parties on their NAMAs through submissions or workshops; and
- any future workshop should not focus on understanding the diversity of NAMAs or the elements of Decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 34, but on other issues.

Parties agreed to have a focused workshop on specific NAMAs, structured in accordance with Decision 2/CP.17, that pays particular attention to support needs, but not limited to this.

Other issues discussed include: considering the diversity of NAMAs under the Subsidiary Bodies after the AWG-LCA finishes its work; developing guidelines for MRV of support; work on the understanding of means of implementation; and developing a common template for pledges from non-Annex I Parties listed in FCCC/AWGLCA/2011/INF.1.

REDD+: REDD+ was considered in a spin-off group, facilitated by Yaw Osafo (Ghana). Issues discussed included: parties' submissions on REDD+ financing related issues; what parties want to achieve in Doha; and the way forward.

On party submissions on REDD+ finance, Guyana, supported by the Philippines, highlighted that the 2°C target can only be achieved if REDD+ is part of the solution. With many others, he underscored that the required scale of financing can only be provided through a variety of sources. Many parties also supported a REDD+ window in the Green Climate Fund. China and others expressed a preference for public sources of financing, with China saying he is open to explore other sources.

Mexico elaborated on a proposal that parties participating in REDD+ establish a national registry to account for the verified emission reductions and carbon stock units and inform a UNFCCC REDD+ registry to prevent double counting.

Brazil supported further work on new ideas on appropriate market-based mechanisms excluding generation of offsets. Bolivia suggested further work on non-market approaches.

The EU said REDD+ emission reductions results should be assessed against independent review. With Switzerland and India, he suggested further work on definitions. Some parties highlighted the relevance of enhancing understanding of "results based performance."

On what parties want to achieve in Doha, in particular on conditions necessary for financing REDD+ results-based actions, some countries preferred broader discussions, with some cautioning on the use of the word "conditions." Key issues discussed included, *inter alia*: how the finance landscape for the post-2012 period will allow countries to implement REDD+; a new market mechanism for REDD+ phase 3; "fixing the gap" for supporting REDD+ preparatory phases; whether to forward the work on finance to the SBI and the scope of this work; MRV of support; support for related activities that do not deliver carbon sequestration, such as adaptation; and interlinkages with discussions held in other groups, such as finance and various approaches.

On the way forward, Chair Tayeb highlighted that the Secretariat will prepare a technical paper, as well as efforts to organize the REDD+ workshop before Doha, despite financing difficulties. Many parties expressed support for organizing the workshop, with some suggesting potential areas to focus on.

Sectoral approaches: The AWG-LCA spin-off group on sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions convened twice, facilitated by George Wamukaya (Kenya).

Parties reflected on the way forward in light of Decision 2/CP.17, which agrees to continue work towards a general framework (paragraph 74) and issues related to addressing emissions from international aviation and maritime transport (paragraph 78).

During the spin-off groups, parties: expressed a willingness to move this item forward within a multilateral setting; reiterated the importance of sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions; and reflected on how to finish or transition work in light of the AWG-LCA's mandate to terminate work in Doha.

Views varied on the framing of a general framework that would apply to all sectors as set out in Convention Article 4.1(c) (reducing emissions on relevant sectors). Parties emphasized that

such a framework should not inhibit investment and growth in these sectors.

On emissions from international transport, parties recognized the roles of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and International Maritime Organization (IMO) and emphasized the importance of the UNFCCC to send a "signal" to these bodies for reducing emissions. Party views varied, however, on how to package the "signal" to these bodies.

On the way forward, many parties expressed that more time is needed before submitting proposals for text that could form the basis of negotiations in the coming sessions. Parties also welcomed the opportunity to make submissions on paragraphs 74 and 78, which will be made available on the UNFCCC website to form the basis of future work at the next session.

Various approaches: Various approaches, including markets, were considered in a spin-off group, facilitated by Alexa Kleysteuber (Chile), and two in-session workshops. For more details on the workshops, held on Saturday, 19 May, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/download/pdf/enb12541e.pdf>.

In the spin-off group, parties were invited to consider various approaches, including opportunities for using markets, to enhance the cost-effectiveness of, and to promote, mitigation actions, bearing in mind different circumstances of developed and developing countries.

On a framework for various approaches, parties focused discussions on paragraph 79 of Decision 2/CP.17 concerning the need for robust standards that deliver real, permanent, additional and verified mitigation outcomes, avoidance of double counting, and achievement of a net decrease and/or avoidance of greenhouse gas emissions.

On the new market-based mechanism, parties discussed the need to elaborate modalities and procedures for, as well as specific elements of, such a mechanism.

Parties requested that the Secretariat prepare a technical paper, and agreed to focus further discussions through workshops.

Response measures: Response measures were discussed in the AWG-LCA contact group. India called for a spin-off group to address unresolved issues on response measures with clear timelines. He elaborated on discussions needed under the AWG-LCA and indicated that the statement, supported by several developing countries, would be delivered to the AWG-LCA Chair. Australia opposed a spin-off group, pointing to Decision 2/CP.17, which "consolidates all progressive discussions related to response measures under the Convention." Saudi Arabia stressed that parties are working to complete and not consolidate work, and that he does not see a mandate for consolidation. The US explained that work in Durban was "painstakingly negotiated."

Saudi Arabia, China, Kuwait, Venezuela, Argentina, India and others, opposed by the EU, Singapore, Mexico, Australia and the US, suggested considering trade measures. Some parties highlighted the World Trade Organization as the appropriate forum to consider trade measures.

Summarizing discussions in the final AWG-LCA contact group, Chair Tayeb explained that a number of parties had expressed the view that response measures have not yet been fully addressed by the AWG-LCA, while others argue that the consideration of the issue has been completed.

Adaptation: Adaptation was discussed in the AWG-LCA contact group. Algeria, for the African Group, the Philippines, Argentina, Nicaragua and other developing countries called for establishing a spin-off group on adaptation, noting the need to further consider NAPs for developing countries that are not LDCs. Bangladesh, for LDCs, also drew attention to gaps in terms of scaling up support, transparency, accounting, risk management and risk reduction strategies.

Saudi Arabia called for addressing economic diversification to build resilience and Egypt highlighted vulnerability assessments and developing countries' urgent needs. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, highlighted that some areas of the Bali Action Plan have not been thoroughly addressed and that the mechanisms established for adaptation and other issues are not yet operational. Opposing the establishment of a spin-off group on adaptation, Switzerland, Norway, the EU and other developed countries pointed to progress and current work under other bodies on, *inter alia*, the Adaptation Committee, and loss and damage.

Chair Tayeb noted in the final contact group that a number of issues were identified during the discussion under adaptation, but there were divergent views about the issues raised and how they are to be addressed.

Finance: Issues related to finance were discussed in the AWG-LCA contact group. The Philippines, for the G-77/China, Algeria, for the African Group, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, India and others, opposed by the US and the EU, called for establishing a spin-off group on finance.

The G-77/China stressed finance as one of the most important pillars of the Bali Action Plan. With many others, she emphasized the need to consider transparency of fast-start finance and the lack of agreement on long-term finance. She stressed the need to discuss financial support for: NAPs in developing countries other than LDCs; biennial update reports; and reporting and verification. The G-77/China also stressed that the financial institutions that "we have now" are "empty shells" and, with the African Group and many developing countries, expressed concern over the finance gap between 2012 and 2020.

Egypt, Pakistan and others called for the consideration of how to conclude institutional arrangements between the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and the COP. The EU indicated that the AWG-LCA is not the proper forum to discuss arrangements between the COP and the GCF. China called for capitalizing the GCF and for the Standing Committee to start its work as soon as possible. Saudi Arabia stated that special attention is needed for the public and private sourcing of finance. Pakistan stressed that closing the finance gap is just as important as closing the mitigation gap.

Many developing countries drew attention to the funding gap from 2013 to 2020, underscoring the need for scaling up finance and for ensuring new, additional and predictable funding. Bangladesh proposed an incremental increase from 2013 to 2020. He also called for a balanced allocation between mitigation and adaptation. Colombia suggested considering an intermediate funding target for the mid-term period. Barbados proposed an additional mid-term period of commitments like fast-start finance. He also indicated that the US\$100 billion per year of long-term finance would be "grossly inadequate" for assisting countries in adaptation. The US noted that the 2020 finance

goal was made in the context of meaningful mitigation action for 2020, questioning whether those parties calling for mid-term finance commitments would also take on mid-term mitigation commitments.

The US and the EU emphasized that: developed countries have provided assurance that there will be no financing gap in 2012-20; a work programme on long-term finance has been established; and developed countries are fully committed to providing fast-start finance. The EU also indicated that decisions on provision of finance have been taken in Durban and Cancun.

Chair Tayeb reported to the final AWG-LCA contact group that a number of issues were identified during the discussion on finance and that there were divergent views about the issues raised and how they are to be addressed.

Technology: On technology, many developing countries supported establishing a spin-off group. Japan, the EU and other developed countries opposed a spin-off group on technology.

The G-77/China underscored the issue as one of the four pillars of the Bali Action Plan and called for further discussions, in particular on IPRs. Algeria, for the African Group, called for a clear distinction between issues to be addressed under the ADP for the post-2020 regime and issues to be finished by the AWG-LCA.

Many developed countries drew attention to progress on technology and its consideration under other UNFCCC bodies. The US and Singapore indicated that there are other avenues to discuss IPRs. Bolivia suggested further discussion on, *inter alia*, barriers to development and transfer of technologies and IPRs that are in the public domain.

Developing countries listed issues for further consideration, including: IPRs; linkages between the technology and financial mechanisms; possible additional functions for the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) in evaluating environmental aspects of technology; and the relationship between the TEC and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN).

During the final AWG-LCA contact group, Chair Tayeb, assisted by Kunihiko Shimada (Japan), reported that parties had an opportunity to have a focused discussion on issues relating to IPRs, the linkage between the Technology Mechanism and the financial mechanism, and additional functions of the TEC and the CTCN. The report also reflected the diversity of parties' views on these issues.

Capacity Building: On capacity building, China, for the G-77/China, supported further discussion on, *inter alia*: institutions, financial mechanisms, monitoring and performance tools. The Philippines highlighted means of implementation. Drawing attention to the recently established Durban Forum for in-depth discussion on capacity building, the US, the EU and other developed countries opposed having a spin-off group.

During the final AWG-LCA contact group, Chair Tayeb noted that although confirming the richness of information that emerged during the first meeting of the Durban Forum on Capacity Building, some parties expressed the view that it does not enable a valid assessment of the delivery of capacity building; and the identification of performance indicators to monitor and assess capacity building is an issue that still needs to be addressed by the AWG-LCA. He also noted that other parties expressed the view that the AWG-LCA does not need

to re-consider capacity-building, as the agreement reached in Durban on the establishment of the Durban Forum addresses substantive issues previously raised by parties.

REVIEW: The spin-off group on Review, facilitated Gertraud Wollansky (Austria), met twice. Parties considered an information paper highlighting the mandate of the group from Decisions 1/CP.16 and 2/CP.17. The main issues discussed were the scope of the Review and the expert consideration of inputs.

On scope, Botswana, for the African Group, supported by China and Brazil, observed that the Durban decision defines the scope and modalities of the Review, and that the scope includes not just the temperature goal but also the adequacy of means of implementation for developing countries. Calling for a prompt start to the Review, Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, with Singapore, the EU and others, emphasized the need for a narrow focus on scope in the context of what was agreed in Cancun.

Saudi Arabia, China, the Philippines and the African Group drew attention to Decision 2/CP.17, which stipulates that parties will continue working on the scope of the Review and consider its further definition. AOSIS and others questioned the value of expanding the scope of the Review.

On the expert consideration of inputs, Japan proposed an open-ended expert meeting format and called for avoiding duplicating the work of the IPCC. Trinidad and Tobago, for AOSIS, opposed by Botswana, for the African Group, China, Brazil and the Philippines, reiterated support for establishing an expert group, highlighting the guiding role that such a body could play. She also noted that tasking the SBs to assist with the Review does not preclude the establishment of an expert body. Norway said an expert body should support and inspire the review process. Canada, supported by the US and Australia, proposed establishing a joint SBSTA/SBI contact group to allow for full deliberation of the Review.

Reporting on progress to the final AWG-LCA, Facilitator Wollansky said that there was a general understanding among parties that the work this year is to further consider the definition of the scope of the review and the expert consideration of the inputs. She highlighted two options for consideration: limiting the scope of the Review; or extending the Review. She also noted another view that there is no need to discuss scope as defined by inputs. She also noted that parties had discussed expert consideration of inputs and various options had been considered, including establishing a new body to provide guidance to review, in addition to the SBs; and that a joint SB contact group should be used because such a group would have party ownership and incur no additional cost. She noted general guidance for expert consideration including: holding meetings with sessions parallel to the SBs; calls for meetings to be open-ended; and to avoid duplication of work. She noted that beginning in 2014 intersessional activities might be required.

OTHER MATTERS: *Countries with economies in transition and countries whose special circumstances have been recognized by the COP:* Chair Tayeb conducted bilateral meetings with relevant parties. Consultations were also held with Turkey, an Annex I country seeking to benefit from financial, capacity-building and technological support due to special circumstances recognized by the COP. A group of EITs presented a draft decision text for consideration in Doha.

CLOSING PLENARY: The AWG-LCA closing plenary took place late in the evening on Thursday, 24 May. Parties agreed to suspend the session to allow the AWG-LCA to resume work at its next meeting.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, stressed the need for an AWG-LCA outcome in Doha to be in line with the Bali Action Plan and decisions taken in Cancun and Durban. She called for further progress, *inter alia*, on adaptation and technology, and an additional negotiating session in Bangkok to allow the AWG-LCA to fulfill its mandate.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, underscored efforts undertaken since 2007 to fulfill the AWG-LCA's mandate and build confidence among parties, including the establishment of transparency requirements for all parties, the Adaptation Framework and the GCF. He said the AWG-LCA was mandated by COP 17 to complete selected activities and suggested that issues requiring more technical consideration after Doha be taken up in the permanent SBs.

The EU highlighted the task in Bonn was to take forward what was mandated in Durban and lamented lack of sufficient progress. She indicated that some items from the Bali Action Plan may not need further work, saying this does not imply that they are less important. She expressed concern over attempts to reopen issues as this could jeopardize the goal of successfully terminating the AWG-LCA. She cautioned against "automatically" transferring issues from the AWG-LCA to the ADP, and supported working in a more effective way, taking into consideration decisions taken in Durban and Cancun.

Switzerland, for the EIG, highlighted that the AWG-LCA is close to fulfilling the Bali Action Plan mandate after the decisions taken in Cancun and Durban. He called for the successful conclusion of the AWG-LCA in Doha and suggested taking forward specific tasks to the SBs and relevant institutions. He indicated that Doha must deliver on the Durban package, including on the clarification of pledges, understanding the diversity of NAMAs, Review and REDD+.

Swaziland, for the African Group, urged the AWG-LCA to give full consideration to adaptation, finance, response measures, and technology transfer and shared vision. On adaptation, he highlighted the need to scale up financial and technology support, and to include NAPs for both LDCs and vulnerable developing countries.

Nauru, for AOSIS, proposed a workshop on common accounting rules to be held in Bangkok and indicated that it should be a full negotiating session. He also proposed a workshop on the diversity of NAMAs for developing countries, highlighting the need for the AWG-LCA to start discussion on the post-2012 financing.

The Gambia, for LDCs, called for a spin-off group on the scale of funding, based on the needs of developing countries.

Egypt, for the Arab Group, identified the need for an additional negotiating session before Doha to allow more time for the AWG-LCA to reach clear agreements, underlining the need for specific results. He proposed a workshop on threats of climate change to developing countries.

Cuba, for ALBA, urged for adequate completion of the work of the AWG-LCA and highlighted support for the Bali Roadmap.

Sierra Leone, for a number of members of the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, stressed the need for an implementable REDD+ mechanism by Doha and called for discussions on REDD+ financing, including a dedicated window in the GCF.

Tajikistan, for Mountainous Landlocked Developing Countries, stressed the importance of long-term finance and the provision of assistance to all developing countries, saying exclusive language will not be acceptable to the group.

The Philippines, for 36 developing countries, underscored the Convention's principles, including common but differentiated responsibilities and equity. He underscored unresolved issues under the AWG-LCA and warned against prematurely agreeing on the conclusion of the AWG-LCA in Doha without ensuring an agreed outcome on all elements of the Bali Action Plan mandate.

The AWG-LCA adopted the report of the session (FCCC/AWG/LCA/2012/L.2). Chair Tayeb underscored the need to start thinking about the agreed outcome to be reached at COP 18. He suspended AWG-LCA 15 at 11:59 pm.

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

SBSTA 36 opened on Monday, 14 May, with Richard Muyungi (Tanzania) as Chair. Parties adopted the agenda and organization of work (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/1) with minor amendments. The SBSTA plenary adopted conclusions on Friday, 25 May.

NAIROBI WORK PROGRAMME ON IMPACTS, ADAPTATION AND VULNERABILITY (NWP): During the SBSTA opening plenary, SBSTA Chair Muyungi reported on progress under the NWP (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.1). The EU welcomed significant progress since the last report. The SBSTA conclusions were prepared by the SBSTA Chair in consultation with interested parties.

SBSTA Conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.4), the SBSTA welcomes the report on progress on implementation of the NWP and notes the Secretariat's efforts on further enhancing its outreach. The SBSTA invites parties and relevant organizations to submit their views by 17 September 2012 on future areas of work.

METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE FOR REDD+: This issue was first addressed in the SBSTA plenary on Thursday, 17 May. It was further addressed in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Peter Graham (Canada) and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz (the Philippines). Main issues discussed included: MRV, forest monitoring systems and drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.

On *national forest monitoring systems*, parties discussed at length the potential features of the system, with many saying it should be built on a phased approach. Parties' views differed on whether activities "shall" or "should" take into account the most recent IPCC guidance. Parties discussed a robust national forest monitoring system, with some underscoring it should provide data and information that is complete, meaning that the information provided should allow the technical analysis of the results of the activities implemented.

On the *type of information to be collected*, Bolivia highlighted that non-market approaches and information on the multiple functions of forests and adaptation should be considered. Some parties underscored that the information

monitored should be selected by each country implementing REDD+. Many developing countries highlighted the need to build capacity and provide adequate support and finance. Some developed countries emphasized the need to include consideration of social and environmental safeguards within the monitoring system and stressed the need for robust information.

On *MRV*, parties discussed possible interlinkages between MRV for NAMAs and for REDD+, with many developing countries highlighting the need to look for synergies. Some emphasized the need to find a balance between the quality and type of information required, while ensuring simplicity and avoiding overburdening developing countries. Many developing countries suggested reference to the need for MRV support. A number of parties emphasized that the system should be built on existing national monitoring systems. Many highlighted linkages with discussions in other groups, such as REDD+ financing under the AWG-LCA. Some underscored that access to technology and information should be facilitated by developed countries, but others also emphasized the role of South-South cooperation. Some parties suggested the information be included in the national communications and biennial update reports.

On *information systems*, a party suggested a technical assessment for the reference levels based on experiences and lessons learned from LULUCF. One party highlighted the need to consider lessons learned from the first report submitted. Norway suggested a "step-wise approach" to MRV.

On *drivers of deforestation and forest degradation*, parties exchanged initial views. Some highlighted that drivers are different in each country and should be addressed at the domestic level. Some parties, opposed by Brazil and Argentina, suggested addressing international drivers in the draft text. Parties did not reflect discussions on drivers in the SBSTA conclusions, as some parties indicated that it was premature to reflect initial discussions.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.9/Rev.1), the SBSTA takes note of the parties' submissions, in particular on drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and on robust and transparent national forest monitoring systems. SBSTA agrees to:

- continue its work on MRV on the basis of an annex containing elements for a possible draft decision; to complete this work at SBSTA 37; and prepare recommendations for a draft decision for consideration by COP 18;
- continue its work on issues identified in Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 72 and Appendix II, in particular on how to address drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, including consideration of social and economic aspects in developing countries at the national level, at SBSTA 37;
- continue consideration of the timing and the frequency of the presentations of the summary of information on how all of the safeguards referred to in Decision 1/CP.16, Appendix I, are being addressed and respected, and the need for further guidance at SBSTA 37, with a view to conclude its consideration at SBSTA 39; and
- initiate work on the technical assessment of the proposed forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels at SBSTA 37, to report to the COP 18 and 19 on progress made, including any recommendations for a draft decision on this matter.

The SBSTA recognizes that:

- further work on methodological guidance may be needed pending the outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA;
- parties aiming to undertake the activities referred to in Decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, could consider the adaptation needs of the country concerned; and
- the annex on elements for a possible draft decision contains bracketed text structured under two subheadings: modalities for national forest monitoring systems and MRV.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND THE TEC'S

REPORT: The discussions and conclusions on technology have been summarized under the SBI on page 21.

RESEARCH AND SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION:

This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.2 and Add.1-2, FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISCs.3-4), was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on 14 May.

The World Meteorological Organization reported on the Draft Implementation Plan and Governance Structure of the Global Framework for Climate Service. The Global Climate Observing System described elements of the Satellite Supplement. The IPCC highlighted elements of the paper on the framework for a new generation of socio-economic scenarios for climate change impacts, adaptation, vulnerability, and mitigation research. On Saturday, 19 May, SBSTA 36 held a research dialogue.

The issue was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Stefan Rosner (Germany) and David Lesolle (Botswana). Parties were unable to reach agreement

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.17), the SBSTA takes note of the parties' views and agrees to continue its consideration of this item at SBSTA 37 on the basis on the draft text contained in the annex to the conclusions.

FORUM AND WORK PROGRAMME ON RESPONSE

MEASURES: This issue was taken up by the SBI and SBSTA plenaries on 14 May. It was subsequently addressed in a joint SBI/SBSTA forum operating as a contact group on all issues related to response measures, and was co-chaired by SBSTA Chair Muyungi and SBI Chair Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland). On 17 May, parties shared views on how to organize the work of the forum. Argentina, for the G-77/China, called for a clear set of modalities for the operationalization of the forum and work programme, including *inter alia*: assigning specific tasks and activities for the rest of the year and creating an outline schedule for 2013 to address the specific needs and concerns of developing country parties. South Africa, for the African Group, stressed economic and social impacts of trade and trade-related measures adopted by developed countries.

The US, supported by Australia, suggested that parties focus discussions on how to undertake the consolidation of response measures issues. The EU suggested that a forum take place in an open context to include non-parties, such as civil society and experts. Australia said work should focus on substantial points of convergence on issues to be addressed in the work programme.

China stressed the importance of the forum to minimize or prevent the negative impacts of response measures, and expressed concern with the inclusion of aviation in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Saudi Arabia suggested exchanging information through, *inter alia*, workshops.

In their closing plenaries, the SBI and SBSTA Chairs reported on positive results achieved in the first meeting of the forum, and that review of the work of the programme will take place with a view to providing recommendations at COP 19. They highlighted that the plan of work is structured along the eight areas identified in Decision 8/CP.17 (Forum and work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures), using modalities adopted by the same decision and taking into account that modalities considered are subject to financial resources.

SBI/SBSTA Conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.18 and FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.25), the SBI and SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- agree to implement the work programme on the impact of the implementation of response measures as contained in the annex;
- request the Secretariat to support, under the guidance of the SBI and SBSTA Chairs, the implementation of the work programme; and
- invite relevant organizations and other stakeholders to participate in the activities of the work programme contained in the annex.

PROTOCOL ARTICLE 2.3 (ADVERSE IMPACTS OF POLICIES AND MEASURES): This matter was considered jointly with other related issues in the response measures forum.

AGRICULTURE: Decision (2/CP.17) requested the SBSTA to consider issues related to agriculture with the aim of adopting a decision at COP 18. This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.6 and Add.1-2) was first considered by the SBSTA on 14 May. Chair Muyungi subsequently facilitated informal consultations.

Throughout the informal consultations, many parties referred to their submissions, highlighting the need to, *inter alia*: ensure that work on agriculture is consistent with the SBSTA mandate in Convention Article 9 (the scope of technical, scientific and methodological work); assess existing scientific and technological knowledge on agriculture and climate change; increase knowledge sharing; enhance information on "knowledge gaps;" improve agricultural productivity and resilience in the context of climate change; and improve capacity building in developing countries.

Many developing countries underscored the importance of adaptation and its relative priority compared to mitigation. They also highlighted the need to achieve food security and the importance of technology transfer. Some countries called for a dialogue on how to facilitate, *inter alia*, technology transfer and innovation. Others called for a work programme to move the process forward. A developing country suggested workshops as a useful way forward. A developed country noted the need to learn more from external bodies and organizations, such as the IPCC. Another developed country highlighted the need to recognize the site-specific nature of agriculture.

On the draft conclusions, parties' views diverged on, *inter alia*: language regarding the aim of the assessment of the current state of scientific knowledge and whether to reference a workshop (FCCC/AWGLCA/2009/CRP.2) and a technical paper (FCCC/TP/2008/8) on opportunities and challenges from mitigation in the agricultural sector. Bolivia, for the G-77/China, objected to the absence of language on adaptation, with the Philippines adding that the word was "profusely used" in

previous discussions. The US expressed support for addressing adaptation concerns, but objected to limiting the focus of work on this issue. No agreement was reached.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its draft conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.19), the SBSTA agrees to continue consideration of this agenda item at its 37th session.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES (CONVENTION):

Work programme on developed country biennial reporting guidelines: This issue was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Helen Plume (New Zealand) and Qiang Liu (China). The group considered the scope of the common tabular format and activities that will be undertaken before Doha.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.11), SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- initiates its consideration of the work programme on a common tabular format;
- acknowledges that, in accordance with Decision 2/CP.17, developed country parties shall use the reporting guidelines for the preparation of the first biennial reports;
- agrees that the work programme on a common tabular format should include the submission of views from parties;
- invites parties to submit their views;
- requests the Secretariat to organize a workshop on common tabular format in October 2012; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of the common tabular format at SBSTA 37.

Work programme on the revision of the guidelines for the review of biennial reports and national communications, including national inventory reviews: This issue was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Helen Plume and Qiang Liu. During the meetings, parties considered, *inter alia*, national inventory reviews for developed country parties with a view to conclude work by COP 19.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.13), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- initiates its consideration of the work programme on the revision on the guidelines for the review of biennial reports and national communications, including national inventory reviews, for developed countries;
- acknowledges that, in accordance with Decision 2/CP.17, biennial reports are due on 1 January 2014 and that Annex I parties are requested to submit their sixth national inventories by the same date;
- requestes the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper summarizing the current review process under the Convention;
- invites parties to submit their views on the elements of the work programme; and
- given the need to complete the work by COP 19, agrees to further consider the work programme on the revision of review guidelines at SBSTA 37.

General guidelines for domestic MRV of domestically supported NAMAs by developing countries: This issue was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group and informal consultations co-chaired by Helen Plume and Qiang Liu.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.15), the SBSTA initiates its consideration of the development of general guidelines for domestic measurement, reporting and verification of domestically supported NAMAs by developing countries and agrees to continue the interactive exchange of views on the guidelines with a view to agreeing on the next steps at SBSTA 37.

Bunker fuels: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.7) was first taken up by the SBSTA on 14 May. SBSTA Chair Muyungi consulted with interested parties and SBSTA conclusions. During the opening SBSTA plenary, the IMO reported on its work to improve energy efficiency in international maritime transport.

Brazil expressed concern regarding the unilateral treatment of emissions in specific regional systems and identified the need to further consider the economic impacts of market-based measures. China noted that the IMO's ship energy efficiency regulations do not reflect the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities in a full and objective manner, and requested that ICAO consider countries' differentiated responsibilities.

Singapore, supported by Panama, welcomed progress made by the IMO and ICAO in addressing climate change in their respective sectors. Japan acknowledged the series of guidelines adopted by the IMO Marine Environment Protection Committee as helpful. The EU welcomed ICAO's efforts to accelerate work towards a global market-based mechanism and encouraged parties to support the IMO's efforts to assess options for such a mechanism. Cuba, on behalf of several countries, expressed concern with respect to unilateral measures in relation to aviation emissions, such as under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Australia welcomed ICAO's shift towards a more action-oriented "implementation mode" and underscored the need for the universal application of market-based measures.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.14), the SBSTA takes note of the information received from, and the progress reported by the secretariats of ICAO and IMO regarding their ongoing work to address emissions from fuel used for international aviation and maritime transport, and notes the views expressed by parties on this information. The SBSTA invites the secretariats of ICAO and IMO to continue to report, at future sessions of the SBSTA, on relevant work on this issue.

Common metrics: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.2) was first taken up by the SBSTA plenary on Monday, 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Michael Gytarsky (Russian Federation).

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.5), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- welcomes the report on the workshop on common metrics, which focused on uncertainties, new and refined areas or metrics, policy goals, and the relationship between policy frameworks and metrics;
- notes that common metrics are being assessed by the IPCC in the context of its work on the Fifth Assessment Report;
- invites the IPCC to present its findings at SBSTA 40; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of the item at SBSTA 40.

Greenhouse gas data interface: During the closing plenary on 25 May, SBSTA Chair Muyungi reported on the issue.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.7), the SBSTA, *inter alia*: welcomes the further improvements made by the Secretariat to the greenhouse gas data interface;

and agrees to consider at SBSTA 38 matters relating to further development of the interface in order to accommodate relevant changes relating to the forthcoming use of the revised reporting guidelines by Annex I parties.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES (PROTOCOL): Carbon capture and storage (CCS) under the CDM: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.8 and Add.1-2), was first addressed by the SBSTA on 14 May. Peer Stiansen (Norway) facilitated informal consultations.

Facilitator Stiansen reported that parties made progress on the establishment of global reserve of Certified Emission Reductions for CCS project activities under the CDM. Discussion focused on, *inter alia*: the eligibility of CCS project activities that involve the transport of carbon dioxide from one country to another, or that involve geological storage sites that are located in more than one country; and the establishment of a global reserve of CER units for CCS project activities.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L. 8), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- agrees to continue consideration of this matter at SBSTA 37;
- invites parties, intergovernmental organizations and admitted observer organizations, by 13 August 2012, to submit their views on the eligibility of certain CCS project activities; and
- requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper on the issue of transboundary effects of project activities for its consideration at SBSTA 37.

Forests in exhaustion under the CDM: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.10) was addressed in the SBSTA plenary on 14 May with informal consultations facilitated by Eduardo Sanhueza (Chile).

Brazil reiterated the importance of the CDM in promoting sustainable development and proposed that definition of forests in exhaustion included in Annex 3 of the proposed agenda for the 50th meeting of the CDM Executive Board. Parties' views on the issue diverged and some supported having further discussions.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.10), the SBSTA takes note of the summary report in document FCCC/SBSTA/2012/MISC.10 and agrees to continue consideration of this agenda item at SBSTA 38.

LULUCF under the CDM: This issue was first addressed in the SBSTA plenary on Thursday, 17 May. It was further addressed in a contact group co-chaired by Marcelo Rocha (Brazil) and Peter Iversen (Denmark).

Parties had an initial exchange of views on issues requested by Decision 2/CMP.7 (LULUCF), in particular on: accounting of emissions by sources and removals by sinks from LULUCF, including through an activity- or land-based approach; modalities and procedures for possible additional LULUCF activities under the CDM; and alternative approaches to addressing the risk of non-permanence under the CDM.

Parties agreed to prioritize work and submit text, with a focus on technical aspects and experiences.

Brazil drew attention to non-permanence under the CDM, in particular to issues such as liability for reversibility, consideration of buffers, and insurance and its implications. Belarus elaborated on time necessary to consider that "permanence" is achieved. The EU suggested that parties also consider how the issue of addressing non-permanence would work, *inter alia*, between different commitment periods.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.3), SBSTA initiates its consideration of the issues related to LULUCF as referred to in Decision 2/CMP.7 (LULUCF), paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 10 for reporting on progress to COP/MOP 8. The SBSTA also invites parties and observers to submit their views for compilation by SBSTA 37 on:

- issues related to modalities and procedures for alternative approaches to addressing the risk of non-permanence under the CDM, in accordance with Decision 2/CMP.7, paragraph 7;
- modalities and procedures for possible additional LULUCF activities under the CDM in accordance with Decision 2/CMP.7, paragraph 6; and
- issues related to a more comprehensive accounting of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks from LULUCF, including through a more inclusive activity-based approach or a land-based approach, as referred to in Decision 2/CMP.7, paragraph 5.

Implications of the implementation of Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7: This issue was first addressed in the SBSTA plenary on 14 May. It was further addressed in a contact group co-chaired by Nagmeldin Elhassan (Sudan) and Anke Herold (Germany).

Co-Chair Herold reported that parties agreed to organize work before Doha in the following way: request that the Secretariat prepare a technical paper; invite parties to submit their views on the technical paper; and discuss those inputs in a technical workshop, subject to the availability of financial resources.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.16), the SBSTA acknowledges the importance of the technical work under this agenda sub-item for the implementation of the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol. The SBSTA also requests the Secretariat to prepare a technical paper, including options to address the relevant methodological decisions. It invites parties to submit, by 21 September 2012, their views on the implications of the implementation of Decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous CMP decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol.

The SBSTA further requests the Secretariat to make these submissions available on the UNFCCC website and to compile them into a miscellaneous document; and organize a technical workshop before SBSTA 37. The SBSTA agreed to continue consideration of this issue at SBSTA 37 and invited the IPCC to consider the possibility of completing the work on the methodological guidance by October 2013 to allow for adoption of a decision on this matter at CMP 9.

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF MITIGATION: This issue was first taken up 14 May in the SBSTA opening plenary.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.2), the SBSTA agrees to continue its consideration of the scientific, technical and socio-economic aspects of mitigation at SBSTA 38, taking into account the best available scientific information on mitigation, in particular information from the IPCC and the ongoing work of other bodies under the Convention on related matters.

COOPERATION WITH RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS: This issue (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/INF.3) was first addressed on 14 May. The IPCC, UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the Convention on

Biological Diversity (CBD) reported on collaboration with the UNFCCC, and identified potential areas for future work and synergies.

SBSTA Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.6), the SBSTA, *inter alia*:

- notes the information paper prepared by the Secretariat on relevant activities in which the Secretariat has been involved with other intergovernmental organizations;
- takes note of the statements made by representatives of the IPCC, and the secretariats of the CBD and UNCCD;
- reaffirms the importance of the Secretariat engaging with other intergovernmental organizations; and
- recognizes the resources and expertise of other intergovernmental and international organizations that are relevant to the UNFCCC process.

CLOSING PLENARY: The SBSTA closing plenary convened on 25 May and adopted the meeting's report (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.1).

Algeria, for the G-77/China, expressed concern regarding, *inter alia*: slow progress on Annex I review guidelines for biennial reports, national communications and annual inventories; and that no conclusion was reached on research and systematic observation. She also highlighted that the ability of developing countries to undertake MRV depends on the extent to which they receive support from developed country parties. She noted that work on agriculture is related to the SBSTA's mandate in Convention Article 9 (establishing the scope of technical, scientific and methodological work by SBSTA) and is to be done on the basis of the principles and provisions of the Convention.

The EU, *inter alia*: recognized that further work remains to be done on drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, safeguards and guidance for the assessment of proposed forest reference levels. He welcomed the constructive atmosphere of the initial exchange of views on issues related to agriculture and expressed disappointment that parties have not been able to conclude work under the agenda item on research and systematic observations. The EU also expressed concern about the difficulties in developing general guidelines on domestic MRV; and welcomed the operationalization of the work programme under the forum on the impact of the implementation of response measures.

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, welcomed the progress on CCS and agriculture. He expressed anticipation for outcomes in Doha on national forest monitoring systems, MRV and safeguards to ensure environmental integrity on REDD+.

Swaziland, for the African Group, stated that, *inter alia*: adaptation remains the highest priority for Africa; work on agriculture must be consistent with the desire to improve food security and the livelihood of local communities; a financing barrier exists for REDD+ implementation in Africa; and that parties should be commended for constructive discussions on response measures.

Nauru, for AOSIS stated that: the long-term global goal should be a key research area discussed during the SBSTA research dialogue and that the focus should be on vulnerable developing countries. She expressed disappointed with the deliberations under the agenda item on research and systematic observations, and expressed hope that the long-term goal will be addressed at each SBSTA session under this agenda item.

Honduras, for the Dominican Republic, Guatemala and El Salvador, stated that the NWP must continue to develop and evolve, and that its reform should involve work with indigenous peoples, local communities and lead to gender mainstreaming. He also expressed his countries support for an approach on food security in agriculture.

Costa Rica, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, welcomed the progress on methodological guidelines on REDD+ activities but said that progress has been limited. He stressed that parties cannot be allowed to reopen issues that have already been agreed upon and expressed concern about lack of progress on research and systematic observation, and marine ecosystems.

Republic of Korea, for EIG, welcomed progress on, *inter alia*: MRV of systems for Annex I and non-Annex I countries; adaptation; technology transfer; and REDD+. She said the group is looking forward to progress on agriculture.

Bolivia, for ALBA, supported the G-77/CHINA and *inter alia*, lamented lack of progress on drivers of deforestation, research and systematic observation, adaptation, agriculture, and water. He also expressed concern that equity and national circumstances are not taken into account in MRV by developing countries.

The Gambia, for LDCs, welcomed progress on procedural issues under the NWP. He said better understanding is needed on the impacts of climate change on agriculture and lamented lack of progress on research and systematic observation.

Business and Industry NGOs pledged to work actively with the TEC and CTCN. She highlighted the need to continue to harness the expertise of the private sector and for strong protection of IPRs.

The International Indigenous People's Forum on Climate Change said that drivers of deforestation pose a threat to indigenous peoples' survival and that MRV systems must capture forest and agricultural values.

YOUNGOs expressed disappointment at the lack of progress on: drivers of deforestation and safeguards to protect biodiversity and indigenous people's rights.

Chair Muyungi declared SBSTA 36 closed at 1:43 pm

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

SBI 36 opened on 14 May, with Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland) as Chair. On the agenda (FCCC/SBI/2012/1), Malaysia, supported by China, Brazil, Egypt, India and others, highlighted the sensitivity of the agenda sub-item on information contained in non-Annex I national communications. Brazil, India, Saudi Arabia, Swaziland, Sudan and others emphasized that retaining the item in abeyance would constitute the most efficient use of time. Nauru, for AOSIS, stressed the need for full substantive discussion on the item and the EU called for compilation and synthesis of information contained in non-Annex I national communications. Chair Chruszczow noted that reaching consensus on this issue appeared impossible. He proposed, and parties agreed, to adopt the agenda with the sub-item on information contained in non-Annex I national communications held in abeyance. The SBI closing plenary adopted conclusion on Friday, 25 May.

ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS: Fifth national communications: This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.6, FCCC/SBI/2011/INF.1 & Add. 1-2, and FCCC/SBI/2011/INF.2) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was

subsequently taken up in informal consultations co-chaired by Julia Martinez (Mexico) and Kiyoto Tanabe (Japan).

Parties considered the status of submissions and review, and compilation and synthesis, of Annex I fifth national communications. Parties also considered compilation and synthesis of supplementary information incorporated in the fifth national communications. Bolivia stressed that Annex I parties' national communications must contain more detail and expressed concern that the some non-EIT countries' emissions was "camouflaged" by the drop in emissions in EITs.

SBI Conclusions: On the status of submissions and review, and compilation and synthesis, of fifth national communications (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.16), the SBI:

- urges Annex I parties to submit their national communications by the relevant date in the future;
- calls on Annex I parties to enhance further the completeness, comparability and level of detail;
- notes that over the period 1990-2008 the total aggregate emissions for all Annex I parties decreased by 6% and by 10.7% when including LULUCF; for EITs, GHG emissions excluding and including LULUCF decreased by 36.7 and 49.7%, respectively; and for non-EITs, GHG emissions excluding and including LULUCF increased by 8 and 8.4%, respectively; and
- decides to recommend a draft decision for adoption by CMP 8 (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.16/Add.1).

In its conclusions on compilation and synthesis of supplementary information incorporated in Annex I fifth national communications (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.15), the SBI:

- urges Annex I parties to enhance further the completeness, comparability and level of detail of the reported information;
- notes that the total aggregate emissions of Annex I parties, excluding emissions from LULUCF, decreased by 16.2%; emissions from EITs decreased by 36.4%; and emissions from non-EITs increased by 0.1% from the base year to 2008, and for several parties the increase was higher; and
- decides to recommend a draft decision for adoption by CMP 8 (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.15/Add.1).

Convention Article 12.5: On 14 May, the SBI plenary agreed to complete the consideration of this issue.

NON-ANNEX I NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Consultative Group of Experts on Non-Annex I National Communications (CGE): This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/2, FCCC/SBI/2012/12-14 and FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.6) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May.

CGE Chair Ruleta Camacho (Antigua and Barbuda) reported on progress in implementing the CGE's work programme. AOSIS and the African Group highlighted the need to extend the CGE's term at least until 2016 and said its mandate should encompass a number of roles. The issue was then taken up in consultations co-facilitated by Julia Martinez and Kiyoto Tanabe.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.22), the SBI welcomes the CGE's progress report. The SBI also:

- urges Annex II parties and other Annex I parties in a position to do so to provide financial resources to enable the CGE to implement planned activities;
- reiterates the invitation to the CGE, in implementing its work programme, to take into account the current and future needs of non-Annex I parties; and

- initiates, but did not conclude, consideration of the term and mandate of the CGE.

The SBI conclusions include an annex and two appendices to facilitate work in Doha.

Convention Article 12.5: On 14 May, the SBI opening plenary agreed to complete the consideration of this issue.

Financial and technical support: This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.7 and FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.7) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 14 May. The Global Environmental Facility (GEF) reported on funding available for non-Annex I national communications and biennial update reports (BURs). The Philippines raised concerns over agreed full-cost funding. The issue was subsequently taken up in informal consultations co-facilitated by Julia Martinez and Kiyoto Tanabe.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.23), the SBI takes note of: the information provided by the GEF on the financial support provided and the GEF policy guidelines for the financing of BURs by non-Annex I countries. The SBI also, *inter alia*: recommends that COP 18 request the GEF to make available support to non-Annex I parties for preparing their BURs; and encourages the GEF to continue ensuring that sufficient financial resources are provided to meet the agreed full costs incurred by developing countries in complying with their reporting obligations.

NAMAs: Prototype registry: This issue was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May and referred to a contact group co-chaired by Elina Bardram (EU) and Wondwossen Sintayehu (Ethiopia).

The Secretariat briefed parties on the functions of the NAMA Registry, which is a dynamic, web-based platform that facilitates the matching of finance, technology and capacity-building support with developing country mitigation actions. A demonstration of the prototype NAMA registry took place on 15 May. Parties noted the value of the Registry in matching projects with funding sources, indicating that it should not substitute other MRV requirements.

SBI Conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.10), the SBI invites further views on the prototype registry; notes the value of testing the functionalities of the prototype; requests a user manual for the prototype; and takes note of the estimated budgetary implications in the development of the prototype.

Technical experts for international consultations and analysis (ICA): This matter (FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.8) was first introduced in the SBI plenary on 14 May. Elina Bardram and Wondwossen Sintayehu co-chaired a contact group. The Philippines stressed the need to link this issue to the provision of resources.

Co-Chair Bardram reported to the SBI closing plenary that while the draft conclusions require fine-tuning, the text fully reflects the views of the parties. She said it may be useful to continue exploring how to bridge gaps between different proposals and to provide additional input to the Secretariat informally.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.21), the SBI decides to continue consideration of this matter at its next session on the basis of draft text annexed to the conclusions. The SBI also recognizes the need to have an efficient, cost-

efficient and practical international consultation and analysis (ICA) process, which does not impose an excessive burden on parties and the Secretariat.

MATTERS RELATING TO FINANCE: Initial review of the Adaptation Fund: This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.2, FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/MISC.1, FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/6 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/6/Add.1) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group co-chaired by Ruleta Camacho (Antigua and Barbuda) and Diane Barclay (Australia).

Discussions focused on a draft text that notes: views of parties and written submissions on initial review of the Adaptation Fund; and issues raised by parties, including those related to the interim institutional arrangements and funding availability. Items highlighted by parties include defining the type of financial information requested from the Adaptation Fund Board, GEF and CDM Executive Board and the mandate for the provision of this information.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.13), the SBI notes:

- some parties have raised issues related to sustainability, predictability and adequacy of the resources for the Adaptation Fund;
- efforts of the Adaptation Fund Board to promote the accreditation of national implementing entities and direct access, and initiatives by the Board to explore options for raising additional resources; and
- further information is required to conduct the initial review of the Adaptation Fund.

The SBI also:

- invites the Adaptation Fund Board to provide additional, disaggregated information on its administrative costs;
- invites parties and relevant organizations to submit to the Secretariat, by 17 September 2012, further views on the review of the Adaptation Fund; and
- agrees to continue its consideration of the initial review of the Adaptation Fund in accordance with the annex to Decision 6/ CMP.6 (Report of the Adaptation Fund Board) at SBI 37.

Other Matters: This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/7 and FCCC/CP/2011/7) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was taken up in a contact group co-chaired by Ruleta Camacho and Diane Barclay.

The Philippines, for the G-77/China, supported by Bangladesh, noted the need for predictability and sustainability of financing for the implementation of adaptation projects.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.14), the SBI:

- encourages donor countries to continue providing funding for country-driven activities;
- notes that existing modalities for implementing NAPA priorities are partially addressing the other elements of the LDC work programme and encouraged the LDC Fund to support technology elements of the work programme; and
- encourages LDC parties to consider the options highlighted in the report of the LDC Expert Group (LEG), which identify various ways to further address the other elements of the LDC work programme.

CONVENTION ARTICLES 4.8 AND 4.9: Progress on the implementation of Decision 1/CP.10 (Buenos Aires Programme of Work): This issue was first taken up in the SBI plenary on 15 May. It was subsequently considered in a joint SBI/SBSTA forum operating as a contact group on issues related to response measures, (see page 15).

Matters related to LDCs: This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/7) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. LEG Chair Pepetua Latasi (Tuvalu) reported on the LEG's work. The issue was subsequently considered in informal consultations facilitated by Colin Beck (Solomon Islands). He reported that the group met twice and discussed the LEG work programme for 2011-2012. Bangladesh, for the G-77/China, stressed that additional resources should be mobilized for the implementation of NAPAs in LDCs.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.2), the SBI, *inter alia*, invites the LEG to continue to assist the LDCs that have not yet completed their NAPAs to complete and submit these as soon as possible, in collaboration with the GEF and its agencies.

NAPs: This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/8 and MISC.1, 2, and Add.1 and MISC.3) was first considered by the SBI on 14 May. The contact group was co-chaired by Richard Merzian (Australia) and Amjad Abdulla (Maldives). The SBI adopted conclusions on 25 May.

Discussions focused on the facilitation of country-driven NAPAs; streamlining the LDC Fund to support the NAP process; the use of national and regional centers and networks; and sharing of best practices in adaptation. Parties also discussed implementation, support programmes and guidance on finance. Several LDCs highlighted the need for strengthening national capacity to ensure integration of adaptation into national development.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.7), the SBI:

- urges developed country parties to mobilize financial support for the NAP process;
- reiterates the request to developed country parties to continue to provide LDC parties with finance, technology and capacity building;
- looks forward to the analysis and compilation of support needed for the NAP process; and
- looks forward to continuing consideration at SBI 37 of guidance on policies and programmes to enable the above.

LOSS AND DAMAGE: This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.3 and FCCC/TP/2012/1) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations co-facilitated by Don Lemmen (Canada) and Lucas Di Pietro (Argentina). Parties considered activities to be undertaken under the work programme on loss and damage. Discussions focused, *inter alia*, on: ways to move forward; thematic area 1 under the work programme on loss and damage (assessing the risk of loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change and the current knowledge on the same); links between loss and damage, and NAPs; and cross-cutting issues.

AOSIS called for establishing an international mechanism to address loss and damage at COP 18. LDCs called for further

elaboration on predictability and adequacy of financial assistance to enhance adaptive capacity.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.12), the SBI, *inter alia*:

- notes the remaining work under the work programme as well as a number of points relevant to assessing the risk of loss and damage, including: a range of approaches to assess the risk; gaps in the assessment of risk; access to, sharing and the use of data; and that enhanced technical and institutional capacities will help developing countries in assessing the risks of loss and damage;
- notes the importance of adopting a holistic approach;
- recalls that COP 17 requested the Secretariat to organize four expert meetings; and
- requests the SBI Chair to convene an informal pre-session meeting to facilitate completion of its work

PROTOCOL ARTICLE 3.14 (ADVERSE EFFECTS):

This matter was considered jointly with other related issues in the response measures forum (see page 15). On 25 May, the SBI Chair reported that consultations were held but this issue could not be completed. The SBI agreed to continue consideration of the issue at SBI 37.

FORUM AND WORK PROGRAMME ON RESPONSE MEASURES: The joint SBI/SBSTA discussions and conclusions have been summarized under the SBSTA (see page 15).

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER: Report of the TEC: This issue (FCCC/SB/2012/1) was first considered by the SBI on 14 May. It was subsequently considered in a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group, co-chaired by Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Zitouni Ould-Dada (United Kingdom).

Parties noted that modalities on linkages with other relevant institutional arrangements under and outside the Convention were “too general” and called for more specific references to interlinkages.

SBI/SBSTA Conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBSTA/2012/L.12) and (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.20), the SBI and SBSTA:

- welcome the rolling work plan of the TEC for 2012-2013;
- note the structured work plan of the TEC on activities mandated by Durban: short-term activities to begin in 2012 and medium-term activities to begin in 2013;
- note the initial ideas of the TEC on its modalities on linkages with other relevant institutional arrangements under and outside the Convention;
- invite TEC to further elaborate its initial ideas on modalities on linkages; and
- note that the TEC will consult with relevant institutional arrangements once they become operational, and report on the results of these consultations at the next session.

Matters relating to the CTCN: This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.4) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently considered in a joint SBI/SBSTA contact group, co-chaired by Carlos Fuller and Zitouni Ould-Dada.

Discussions focused on the host of the CTCN. Parties discussed details of the negotiation process with the shortlisted host proponents and elements of the host agreement, with parties underscoring the need for transparency in the process.

SBI/SBSTA Conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.18), the SBI and SBSTA:

- agree on a ranked list of proponents, with the consortium led by the United Nations Environment Programme ranked first, the GEF ranked second and Det Norske Veritas AS ranked third for hosting the CTCN;
- request the Secretariat to promptly initiate a discussion on the key elements of the potential host agreement with the proponent ranked first and, if needed, with the proponents ranked second and third, in parallel; and
- agree to recommend the host of the CTC at SB 37 to COP 18, requesting the GEF to support the operationalization and activities of the CTCN.

Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer:

This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/9) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently considered in a contact group, co-chaired by Carlos Fuller and Zitouni Ould-Dada.

During discussions, parties reiterated the need to ensure a balance between adaptation and mitigation projects in the long-term implementation of the Poznan Strategic Programme and discussed methodologies to encourage more adaptation projects.

SBI Conclusions: In the conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.19), parties agree to invite the GEF to enhance balance between adaptation and mitigation projects; for the GEF and implementing agencies to expedite the completion of remaining pilot projects; and for the GEF to align the implementation of its climate technology centers and network with the CTCN operationalization activities.

CONVENTION ARTICLE 6 (education, training and awareness-raising): This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/3-5, FCCC/SBI/2012/Misc.4 and FCCC/CP/2011/7/Add.2), was considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May and in informal consultations, facilitated by Tony Carritt (EU). Parties discussed a draft text submitted by the G-77/China on recommendations to be considered for the Doha Work Programme, and the role of the Secretariat and intergovernmental organizations. They also heard recommendations from YOUNGOS, the Climate Action Network and Local Government and Municipal Authorities on issues to be strengthened in the text, including gender, local communities, and specific reporting requirements.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.26), the SBI agree to continue consideration of this item at SBI 37 on the basis of the draft text contained in the annex, in which parties:

- decide to adopt the eight-year Doha Work Programme on Convention Article 6, as contained in the appendix to this decision;
- decide to review the work programme in 2020, with an intermediate review of progress in 2016; and
- request the SBI to enhance the work on Convention Article 6 by organizing an annual in-session dialogue.

CAPACITY BUILDING (CONVENTION): This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/10 and FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.5) was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. Kunihiko Shimada (Japan) facilitated informal consultations.

Parties considered issues regarding capacity building for EITs. They noted that most issues facing EITs are reflected in synthesis report (FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.5) and that further work to build capacity is needed.

The first meeting of the Durban Forum took place on 22 May. For more details, see: <http://www.iisd.ca/vol12/enb12543e.html>.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.4), the SBI notes that capacity building for EITs is essential in enabling their commitments under the Convention and the decision to conclude the third review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in EITs at SBI 46. It invites parties and relevant organizations to submit to the Secretariat, by February 2016, information on how they have implemented capacity-building activities. The SBI requests the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report based on these submissions.

CAPACITY BUILDING (PROTOCOL): This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/10, FCCC/SBI/2012/MISC.5), was first considered by the SBI plenary on 14 May. Kunihiko Shimada facilitated informal consultations.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.5), the SBI notes capacity building for EITs is essential in enabling their commitments under the Convention and the decision to conclude the third review of the implementation of the framework for capacity building in EITs at SBI 46. It invites parties and relevant organizations to submit to the Secretariat, by February 2016, information on how they have implemented capacity-building activities. The SBI requests the Secretariat to prepare a synthesis report based on these submissions.

COMPLIANCE: This issue (FCCC/KP/CMP/2005/2) was taken up by the SBI plenary on Monday, 14 May. Chair Chruszczow consulted interested parties. The item was deferred to SBI 37.

APPEALS AGAINST CDM EXECUTIVE BOARD

DECISIONS: This issue (FCCC/SBI/2011/17, Annex 1, FCCC/SBI/2011/MISC.2, FCCC/TP/2011/3 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/3) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group co-chaired by Kunihiko Shimada and Yaw Osafo (Ghana).

Parties considered procedures, mechanisms and institutional arrangements for appeals against the decisions of the CDM Executive Board. Co-Chair Shimada reported some progress on modalities and geographic distribution of nominees. Divergent views remained on the issue of quorum, scope and standing before the appeals body.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.8), the SBI notes progress in setting out some of the features of the possible appeals body and that different views remain on, *inter alia*, the issue of scope. The SBI agrees to continue its consideration of the matter at SBI 37 on the basis of, *inter alia*, the draft text contained in the annex with a view to forwarding a draft decision for consideration by CMP 8.

REVIEW OF THE COMMITMENT PERIOD RESERVE:

This issue was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in a contact group chaired by Chair Chruszczow.

AOSIS expressed doubt as to whether a redesign is needed and stressed that discussions on this issue should not prejudice AWG-KP outcomes.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.11), the SBI states that it: initiated its consideration of the review and revision, as appropriate, of the design of the commitment period reserve for the subsequent commitment period; and agrees to continue consideration of this item at SBI 37.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETINGS: This matter was first considered in the SBI plenary on 14 May. A contact group was chaired by Chair Chruszczow. The SBI adopted conclusions on 25 May.

Parties considered the organization of COP 18 and CMP 8, future sessional periods and participation of observers (FCCC/SBI/2012/11). Chair Chruszczow encouraged Eastern European states to present an offer to host COP 19 and CMP 9 as soon as possible.

The G-77/China and the Russian Federation highlighted the need for additional negotiating time between Bonn and Doha, while acknowledging financial constraints. The US, supported by Canada and Australia, proposed organizing workshops instead of a negotiating session. India and South Africa said workshops could be integrated into the negotiating process.

During the SBI closing plenary on 25 May, Chair Chruszczow reported that sufficient funds for an additional intersessional meeting have not yet been pledged. Bangladesh, for the G-77/China, said the situation was regrettable and urged parties in the position to offer resources to do so. Saudi Arabia proposed an amendment to the conclusions text reflecting the importance of a meeting in Bangkok. Parties agreed to amend the text to reflect that resources have not yet been pledged and the deadline for making pledges is Tuesday, 29 May.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.24), which were revised in plenary, the SBI invites the Bureau of COP 17 and CMP 7 to finalize the details of the arrangements for COP 18 and CMP 8, including arrangements for the high-level segment, in consultation with the President Designate of COP 18 and CMP 8 and the Secretariat. The SBI also stresses the importance of the principles of transparency and inclusiveness in the lead-up to and during COP 18 and CMP 8.

The SBI notes the agreement of parties on the importance of additional intersessional resumed sessions of the *ad hoc* working groups before the Doha Conference. The SBI takes note of the information provided by the Executive Secretary on the provisional preparations for additional intersessional resumed sessions of the *ad hoc* working groups and noted the critical and urgent need for financial contributions in order for the Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements. The SBI invites the UNFCCC Executive Secretary to explore cost-saving measures to facilitate these additional intersessional resumed sessions of the *ad hoc* working groups to be held from Thursday, 30 August, to Wednesday, 5 September 2012, in Bangkok, Thailand. The SBI invites all presiding officers, in consultation with the Bureau, to give serious consideration to streamlining the work of the *ad hoc* working groups while ensuring that all bodies can complete their mandated tasks.

The SBI also notes that sufficient voluntary contributions have not been confirmed and that in the absence of such contributions or pledges by 29 May 2012 it would not be possible for the Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements.

The SBI also notes that, in keeping with the principle of rotation among regional groups, the President of COP 19 and CMP 9 would come from Eastern Europe and the President of COP 20 and CMP 10 would come from GRULAC. The SBI also notes the ongoing consultations with regard to hosting COP 19 and CMP 9 and urges parties to come to a conclusion on this

issue so that a decision could be taken at COP 18. The SBI also invites parties to come forward with offers to host future sessions of the COP and CMP, including COP 20 and CMP 10.

ADMINISTRATIVE, FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: Budget performance for the biennium 2012-2013. This issue (FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.5) was first introduced in the SBI plenary on 14 May. UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres emphasized that timely contributions are crucial. The SBI took note of the status of contributions and requested that parties make their outstanding contributions.

Continuing review of the Secretariat's functions: The SBI took note of the available information.

Implementation of the Headquarters Agreement: On the Secretariat's office facilities, Germany reported that the new premises would be handed over on United Nations Day on 24 October 2012. She noted that the second office premises would be ready for occupation in 2017 and that the World Conference Center was scheduled for completion in 2013.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.17), the SBI takes note of the information provided by the representative of the Host Government of the Secretariat that construction work on the new conference facilities in Bonn resumed and that some of the components of SBI 38 could be held there. The SBI encourages the Host Government to ensure that the conference facilities are fully completed as soon as possible in 2013. The SBI also notes the reports made by the Host Government and the Executive Secretary of the progress made in the completion of the new office premises for the Secretariat.

Transaction log fees: This issue (FCCC/TP/2010/1, FCCC/SBI/2009/MISC.3 and Add.1, FCCC/SBI/2010/MISC.4, FCCC/KP/CMP/2011/7 and Corr.1, FCCC/KP/CMP/2010/8 and FCCC/KP/CMP/2009/19) was first taken up by the SBI plenary on 14 May. It was subsequently taken up in informal consultations facilitated by Toshiyuki Nagata (Japan). Parties considered methodology for the collection of international transaction log fees in the biennium 2014-2015.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.6), the SBI recommends a draft decision for adoption by CMP 8.

Privileges and Immunities: This issue was first introduced in the SBI plenary on 14 May. Kunihiko Shimada facilitated informal consultations. During the SBI closing plenary Shimada reported that parties had further refined draft treaty agreements and had removed some aspects.

SBI Conclusions: In its conclusion (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.9), the SBI agrees to conclude its consideration of this issue and forward the draft text contained the annex for consideration to CMP 8. The SBI recommends that CMP 8 consider the way forward, in particular the form of the forum for, and the scope of, the discussions.

CLOSING PLENARY: The SBI closing plenary took place on 25 May and parties adopted the report of SBI 36 (FCCC/SBI/2012/L.1).

Australia, for the Umbrella Group, highlighted progress on adaptation and integration of capacity-building priorities across the Convention. He said that NAPs and the loss and damage work programme can generate tangible benefits for developing countries. He welcomed the commencement of the Durban

Forum on Capacity Building and said his country was keen to conclude the review of the Adaptation Fund in Doha. He said more work needs to be done on MRV, including on the adoption of modalities and procedures for the ICA technical team of experts.

Swaziland, for the African Group, highlighted the importance of technology transfer, capacity building and financial support to developing countries. He stressed adaptation as the key priority for his region and welcomed progress on loss and damage saying that more work needs to be done on various approaches and the role of the Convention. Welcoming progress on finance, he described as crucial predictable, sustainable and adequate financial support for national adaptation plans as well as adequate and predictable funding of the Adaptation Fund.

Nauru, for AOSIS, said her group looks forward to the review of the Adaptation Fund and acknowledges its critical role for implementing adaptation projects. She highlighted capacity building as a cross-cutting issue and welcomed the work programme on response measures, expressing concern that response measures were also being addressed under other bodies. She said MRV is crucial for building trust among parties and noted the need for a permanent space for exchange of information on education, training and public awareness. She expressed disappointment that the agenda item on information contained in non-Annex I national communications was held in abeyance.

The Gambia, for LDCs, welcomed conclusions related to the Adaptation Fund. He said that predictability and adequacy of technical and financial assistance to developing countries is not fully reflected in the conclusions on loss and damage. He urged developed countries, the GEF and its implementing entities to continue financial support of NAPs. He said his group would like to have a strong body to conduct ICA with respect to biennial update reports. He expressed concern about the lack of financial resources for finalizing the prototype of the Registry.

Algeria, for the G-77/China, *inter alia*: recalled the need to operationalize ICA in a non-intrusive and non-punitive manner that respects sovereignty; welcomed the constructive work under the forum on response measures; expressed support for progress on the work programme on loss and damage; and expressed concern over the diminishing resources for the Adaptation Fund due to the low market prices of Certified Emission Reductions, affecting the balance of adaptation and mitigation.

The EU welcomed, *inter alia*: progress towards the implementation of the work programme on loss and damage; the first session of the Durban Forum on Capacity Building; the operationalization of the work programme under the forum on the implementation of response measures; and conclusions and a draft CMP decision on the methodology for calculating the International Transaction Log fees for the 2014-2015 biennium.

Mexico, for the EIG, recalled the need to finish work under the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP in order to move towards a "technical or implementation phase," and underscored the relevance of the SBI towards operationalizing the Bali Action Plan. Progress was highlighted on, *inter alia*: the national adaptation plans process; the work programme on loss and damage; and prototype of the NAMA registry.

Ecuador, for the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, highlighted, *inter alia*: the need for adequate, predictable and scaled-up

support for developing countries with regard to all elements under the Convention, especially REDD+; and the need for MRV measures to be consistent between NAMAs and REDD+.

Honduras, for SICA, welcomed progress on loss and damage and highlighted the need for: further progress on NAPs; full and timely support for adaptation measures from developed countries; and financial resources to compensate loss and damage, noting that COP 18 should work towards prevention and the reduction of damages as a main priority.

The Climate Action Network welcomed progress made on the first Durban Forum on Capacity Building and the SBI conclusions on loss and damage. Local Governments and Municipal Authorities welcomed efforts to continue integrating work of governments at all levels in relation to adaptation, and loss and damage. YOUNGOs stressed the importance of education for young people in the context of Article 6, and requested sufficient time to discuss this issue in Doha.

SBI 36 closed at 9:26 pm.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE BONN CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE

Six months ago, many delegates left the UN Climate Change Conference in Durban basking in the warm glow of success, imbued with the infectious spirit of “Ubuntu,” or unity and interconnectedness. The conference had agreed on several landmark decisions including: the establishment a new *Ad Hoc* Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) and “a process to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force applicable to all parties” to come into effect from 2020 onwards; a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol; and agreement to terminate the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA) and *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Annex I Parties’ Further Commitments under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) in Doha. Many saw these decisions as heralding a new era of multilateralism and turned to 2012 with anticipation, vigor and purpose.

Six months later, the pressure was on delegates in Bonn to live up to the promise of Durban. Delegates faced a heavy workload, including the tasks needed to operationalize the institutions and mechanisms established in Cancun and Durban. Parties also had to try to demystify what it was they had actually agreed to during the waning hours of the frenzied COP 17. However, negotiations in 2012 got off to an inauspicious start and the Bonn Climate Change Conference was marred by mistrust and unabashed posturing. The meeting was almost paralyzed by prolonged procedural wrangling, which many described as “unprecedented.” This analysis will discuss the underlying reasons for the disputes in Bonn and examine the implications for COP 18 in Doha, Qatar, in another six months.

UNRAVELING DURBAN’S CONSTRUCTIVE AMBIGUITY

Many could not begin to imagine how difficult it would be to begin implementing the Durban decisions. The new platform established in Durban introduced the notions of a “post-2012 or pre-2020” landscape; and a “post-2020” period, that will be covered by the new “protocol, another legal instrument or an

agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all parties” to be developed by the ADP.

The Durban Package, which had been negotiated sensitively to accommodate the myriad of parties’ interests, presented challenges and complexities in Bonn, when parties began the business of interpreting its ambiguous language. For example, while many parties see mitigation as the core of the ADP, some developing countries insisted that all elements, including financing, adaptation, capacity building and technology transfer, should also be central to the ADP’s mandate.

For many, enhancing ambition to close the “mitigation gap” was a crucial part of Decision 1/CP.17. The decision establishes that the ADP process for the post-2020 regime shall raise the level of ambition and also launches a post-2012 work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition for all parties. However, the decision does not stipulate when and which body will implement the work plan. While some developing parties supported addressing pre-2020 mitigation ambition under the AWG-LCA, many others insisted on addressing it under the ADP.

The reason why some preferred to address enhancing mitigation ambition under the AWG-LCA is that the Bali Action Plan affirms the Convention’s core principles, including common but differentiated responsibilities. This implies that developed countries have commitments, while developing countries only take nationally appropriate mitigation actions contingent on support from developed countries. This level of comfort is missing under the ADP for developing countries. Indeed, the decision adopting the ADP does not include references to the Convention’s principles nor does it make a distinction between developed and developing countries. As one insider highlighted, “some parties have started to panic about the ADP; they feel as if they are walking into a dark room and don’t know if there is anything there or where anything is.” This uncertainty manifested in disagreements over both the AWG-LCA and the ADP agendas. On the ADP agenda, parties ultimately agreed to address two work streams, one on the post-2020 regime and the other on the post-2012 work plan on enhancing the level of ambition.

Uncertainties also arose when considering the termination of the AWG-LCA in Doha. Decision 1/CP.17 extends the AWG-LCA’s “mandate for one year in order for it to continue its work and reach the agreed outcome pursuant to decision 1/CP.13 (Bali Action Plan)”, until COP 18 at which it “shall be terminated.” However, Durban left room for different interpretations on how to proceed with the inconclusive work beyond Doha. The lack of clarity on the AWG-LCA termination provided room for discussions on whether the AWG-LCA should finish after the Bali Action Plan was accomplished or if the Bali Action Plan was accomplished by the termination of the AWG-LCA. Some parties, particularly a group of developing countries, wanted to assess the progress achieved toward fulfilling the Bali Action Plan, including some elements that were not agreed upon in Durban but were reflected in a compilation document referred to as “CRP.39,” such as intellectual property issues in relation to technology, rights of Mother Earth, trade, and response measures. Meanwhile, many developed countries wanted to focus on specific issues mandated by COP 17. They highlighted that many issues mandated by the Bali Action Plan had already been properly addressed and forwarded to the permanent subsidiary

bodies or other relevant institutions created for that purpose, such as the Technology Executive Committee, the Green Climate Fund, the Adaptation Committee and the Durban Forum on Capacity Building.

Nevertheless, the extent to which the permanent subsidiary bodies and the new bodies can address these issues is limited to their technical nature or their particular mandate. Moreover, many of the established bodies still need to be operationalized, as many highlighted. The fact that progress towards their operationalization was not achieved in Bonn did not help to enhance the environment of cooperation. On finance, the Philippines provided examples of this phenomenon, underscoring that the GCF is still “an empty shell, and the Standing Committee is not standing.”

In Durban, under the AWG-KP track, parties agreed to “decide that the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol shall begin on 1 January 2013.” However, it is clear to everybody that to “really adopt” the second commitment period parties will have to agree on its length, put forward QELROs and adopt the necessary amendments to the Kyoto Protocol in Doha. Some questions remain on key issues such as how to ensure a smooth transition to the second commitment period, how to deal with excess units from the first commitment period, how rules can be continued and, in particular, how to continue with the flexibility mechanisms, including who will be able to participate, given that some countries indicated they would not be part of a second commitment period. In Bonn, developing countries reiterated that parties intending to participate in the second commitment period should submit ambitious QELROs in line with the goal of limiting temperature increase to below 2°C. Venezuela vociferously demanded that Annex I parties “show their QELROs” as opposed to pledges. The EU highlighted their submission of QELROs and also called upon his Annex B colleagues to follow suit.

Moreover, in order to finish shaping the second commitment period and properly adopt it in Doha, parties have to agree on its length and on the text of the Kyoto Protocol amendment, but negotiations in Bonn did not lead to any further progress in this regard. With so many relevant details to be defined before Doha, developing countries expressed fear that parties are “jumping from the Kyoto Protocol ship” by shifting the focus on the ADP. The EU and other developed countries argued, in turn, that their agreement on a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol was based on a transition to a global and comprehensive post-2020 climate treaty to be negotiated under the ADP.

EVOLVING DYNAMICS IN A CHANGING WORLD

If anything, the Bonn session brought to the fore the universally acknowledged fact that the UNFCCC, drafted in 1992, reflects a reality light years away from the 2012 global landscape. Since the negotiation of the Convention, the outlook for many G-77/China members has changed dramatically and resulting tensions from these divergences are increasingly playing out in the negotiating rooms. For several years now, many have been wagering bets on how long the G-77/China tinderbox diplomacy can prevail, when it is evident that many of the members appear to sit uncomfortably around the same table. A discernible chasm was evident in Bonn. As one delegate said, “Members of the group are now washing their dirty linen

very publically.” The group did not have a common negotiating position on the ADP and many other issues. Moreover, they had trouble agreeing on fielding one non-Annex I candidate for the position of ADP Chair. As one practitioner explained, the UNFCCC governance structure assumed certain things, including that parties fall neatly into two groups: Annex I and non-Annex I countries. This “binary” dynamic has changed. As one delegate noted: “GRULAC and the Asian Group are the dominant forces but they do not represent the interests of the entire group.” This means that, in addition to the traditional distinction between developed and developing countries, a third category of “emerging developing countries” or “advanced developing countries” may need to be factored into the mix.

Ultimately, the specter of having to vote for the ADP officers and the resulting damage to the process proved too much for parties to stomach, and they eventually agreed to a “delicate arrangement,” where the candidate from the Asia-Pacific Group will serve an initial one year term from 2012-2013, with his counterpart from an Annex I party, and the subsequent Co-Chair from GRULAC will serve for a term of 18 months. Many said that creating a voting precedent under the UNFCCC would be difficult, almost unfathomable but, at times during the meeting it appeared as if the taboo would be broken.

Other dynamics also played out within the G-77/China, which caught many practitioners by surprise. Bonn witnessed the emergence of a group of approximately 40 countries primarily comprised of the Arab Group, Latin American countries, including Argentina, Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador, as well as India and China, who, on the face of things, appear to have forged an alliance to uphold the Convention’s principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and equity, as well as developed countries’ historical responsibility for climate change. They maintain that any outcome under the ADP must be equitable so that “universality of application” does not become “uniformity of application.”

In contrast, another group of developing countries, including members from AOSIS, LDCs, and some Latin American countries, such as Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Peru and Panama, are looking for such action on mitigation from developed and developing countries and for action to be “incentivized for all countries,” which they describe as the “beginning of a new paradigm for responding to climate change.”

Reflecting on the developments within the G-77/China, one insider said “history is being made and the wedge within the group is helping to bring about an exciting geo-political shift, which is about how countries deal with each other politically and economically and also a reflection of where they are and where they will be.”

LOOKING AHEAD

Bonn demonstrated that, as many have said, Durban was a carefully negotiated package contingent on all elements of the outcome moving forward in tandem. However, what is clear is that parties have a very different perspective of what the future looks like in terms of, *inter alia*, the ADP’s mandate, how to terminate the AWGs and what to focus on for effectively addressing climate change. As evidenced in Bonn, constructive ambiguity results in uncertainty that can sometimes breed

mistrust. This mistrust is often manifested through disputes over procedure and consequently hampers progress. Looking ahead, parties have their work cut out to accomplish tasks they agreed to in Durban. They will need to exercise goodwill, integrity and congeniality in order to deliver on the ultimate objective of meaningful mitigation action for the post-2012 era.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Third meeting of the Technology Executive Committee:

The third meeting of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) will be convened in May 2012. **dates:** 28-29 May 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://unfccc.int/ttclear/jsp/TECMeeting.jsp>

29th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee: The Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) holds its regular meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of Joint Implementation (JI). **dates:** 28-30 May 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

Climate Adaptation Futures: Second International Climate Change Adaptation Conference 2012: Co-hosted and convened by the University of Arizona (US) and the Programme of Research on Climate Change Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation (PROVIA) of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), this conference will focus on adaptation to climate variability and change. **dates:** 29-31 May 2012 **location:** Tucson, Arizona, USA **contact:** University of Arizona Institute of the Environment **phone:** +1-520-626-9987 **email:** adaptationfutures2012@gmail.com **www:** <http://www.adaptation.arizona.edu/adaptation2012>

Seventh ITU Symposium on ICTs, the Environment and Climate Change: This symposium, organized by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and the Government of Canada, aims to raise awareness of the role of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in climate change mitigation and adaptation, thereby advancing the "green ICT" agenda. **dates:** 29-31 May 2012 **location:** Montreal, Canada **contact:** Louise Roderick **phone:** +1-613-998-9489 **fax:** +1-613-998-4530 **email:** Louise.Roderick@ic.gc.ca **www:** <http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/worksem/climatechange/201205/index.html>

Second meeting of the CDM Policy Dialogue: The second meeting of the CDM Policy Dialogue will take place in May 2012. **dates:** 30-31 May 2012 **location:** Frankfurt, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

Carbon Expo 2012: The international trade fair and conference for emissions trading, carbon abatement solutions and clean technologies is sponsored by the World Bank. **dates:** 30 May - 1 June 2012 **location:** Cologne, Germany **contact:** Guido Hentschke **phone:** +49-221-821-3097 **fax:** +49-221-821-99-1060 **email:** g.hentschke@koelnmesse.de **www:** http://www.carbonexpo.com/en/carbon_expo/home/index.php

Africa Policy Dialogue stakeholder consultations: Africa Policy Dialogue stakeholder consultations will take place in June 2012. **dates:** 4 June 2012 **location:** Johannesburg, South Africa **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

GEF 42nd Council Meeting: The Global Environment Facility (GEF) Council meets for three days, twice each year. **dates:** 4-7 June 2012 **location:** Washington DC, USA **contact:** GEF Secretariat **phone:** +1-202 473-0508 **fax:** +1-202 522-3240 **email:** secretariat@thegef.org **www:** <http://www.thegef.org/gef/meetingdocs/97/452>

37th Meeting of the CDM Small Scale Working Group: The Small Scale Working Group of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) will hold its 37th meeting to consider matters relating to small scale CDM project activities, including proposals for new baseline and monitoring methodologies for small scale project activities. **dates:** 5-8 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

IPCC 35: Agenda items for the 35th session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change will include the future work programme of the task force on national greenhouse gas inventories (TFI), progress in the preparation of the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) and the communications strategy and outreach. **dates:** 6-9 June 2012 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **contact:** IPCC Secretariat **phone:** +41-22-730-8208/54/84 **fax:** +41-22-730-8025/13 **email:** ipcc-sec@wmo.int **www:** <http://ipcc.ch>

4th CDM Roundtable: The 4th CDM Roundtable will be held in June 2012. **dates:** 8 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

56th Meeting of the CDM Methodology Panel: The CDM Methodology Panel will hold its 56th meeting to consider matters relating to CDM baseline and monitoring plans and methodologies. **dates:** 11-15 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

UNFCCC regional expert meeting on loss and damage: The UNFCCC regional expert meeting on a range of approaches to address loss and damage associated with adverse effects of climate change will be held in June 2012. **dates:** 13-15 June 2012 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/loss_and_damage/items/6872.php

Rio Conventions Pavilion at Rio+20: The Rio Conventions Pavilion at Rio+20 is a collaborative outreach activity of the Secretariats of the Rio Conventions (UNFCCC, UNCCD and CBD), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and 25 other international, national and local partners. It aims to promote and strengthen synergies between the Rio Conventions at implementation levels by providing a coordinated platform for awareness raising and information sharing about the linkages

in science, policy and practice between biodiversity, climate change and combating desertification/land degradation. **dates:** 13-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** Rio Conventions Pavilion **phone:** +1-514-288-6588 **fax:** +1-514-288-6588 **email:** info@riopavilion.org **www:** http://www.riopavilion.org/

Latin America Policy Dialogue stakeholder consultations: Latin America Policy Dialogue stakeholder consultations will be held in June 2012. **dates:** 15 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

Dakar: Managing the Regional Risks of Climate Extremes and Disasters – Learning from the IPCC Special Report: This event is part of a series of briefings to publicize the findings of the IPCC Special Report titled “Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters for Advancing Climate Change Adaptation” to policy makers, practitioners and private sector audiences. This event is by invitation only. **dates:** 18-19 June 2012 **location:** Dakar, Senegal **contact:** Climate and Development Knowledge Network **phone:** +44-207-212-4111 **email:** cdknetwork.enquiries@uk.pwc.com **www:** http://cdkn.org/

60th Meeting of the CDM Accreditation Panel: The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Accreditation Panel will hold its 60th meeting to consider matters relating to the accreditation of operational entities. **dates:** 18-21 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

European Union Sustainable Energy Week: European Union Sustainable Energy Week events will take place across Europe. Events in Brussels will center around a high-level conference on the sustainable energy sector, which is expected to draw 4,000 participants from over 50 countries. Throughout the week other events will take place in parallel to draw attention to energy efficiency and sustainable energy themes. **dates:** 18-22 June 2012 **location:** Brussels, Belgium **email:** brussels@eusew.eu **www:** http://www.eusew.eu

IDB Climate Change and Sustainability Day: The Inter-American Development Bank is organizing an event on Climate Change and Sustainability on the sidelines of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD, or Rio+20). Discussions will address, among other topics: mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilient low carbon development, biodiversity, sustainable energy and the challenges of a local level sustainability agenda. **date:** 20 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **www:** http://events.iadb.org/calendar/eventDetail.aspx?lang=en&id=3475

UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD or Rio+20): The UN General Assembly, in December 2009, adopted a resolution calling for a UNCSD to be convened in Brazil in 2012. This meeting will mark the 20th anniversary of the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), which convened in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992. **dates:** 20-22 June 2012 **location:** Rio de Janeiro, Brazil **contact:** UNCSD Secretariat **email:** uncsd2012@un.org **www:** http://www.uncsd2012.org/

36th Meeting of the CDM Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group: The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Afforestation and Reforestation (A/R) Working Group holds regular meetings to consider matters relating to CDM A/R project activities, including preparing recommendations on submitted proposals for new baseline and monitoring methodologies. **dates:** 20-22 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

28th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel: The 28th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel will take place in June 2012. **dates:** 21-22 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

The Mediterranean City: A Conference on Climate Change Adaptation: This conference will initiate an ongoing collaboration of cities working together to share ideas, needs and strategies to adapt to the current and future impacts of climate change as they similarly affect the five Mediterranean-climate regions of the world. **dates:** 25-27 June 2012 **location:** Los Angeles, California, USA **www:** http://www.cvent.com/events/the-mediterranean-city-conference/event-summary-608171ff129f41ca824e89f112c41848.aspx

First IUFRO-FORNESSA Regional Congress: The Congress will provide a platform for African forest scientists, forest managers and policy makers and their colleagues from other parts of the world to share and exchange information and experiences on critical issues affecting forest and wildlife resources in Africa. The Congress will highlight research that puts relevant information in the hands of forest communities, forest managers, policy makers, the private sector and civil society. Specific themes to be covered include: forests and climate change; forests and water; forest policy, governance and trade; forest biodiversity and conservation; and agroforestry, energy and food security. IUFRO is the International Union of Forestry Research Organizations. **dates:** 25-29 June 2012 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** Joe Cobbinah **phone:** +233-244-405-601 **fax:** +233-03220-60121 **email:** iufrofor_2012@yahoo.com **www:** http://www.fornis.net/congress/en/homepage

18th Meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board: The Adaptation Fund Board supervises and manages the Adaptation Fund under the authority and guidance of parties to the Kyoto Protocol. **dates:** 28-29 June 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** Marcia Levaggi **phone:** +1-202-473-6390 **email:** mlevaggi@thegef.org **www:** http://www.adaptation-fund.org/page/calendar

Second International 100% Renewable Energy Conference and Exhibition: IRENEC 2012 is organized by EUROSOLAR Turkey, the Turkish section of the European Association for Renewable Energies, and will serve as an international platform to discuss technical, economic and political aspects of a transition to 100% renewable energy. **dates:** 28-30 June 2012 **location:** Istanbul, Turkey **contact:** EUROSOLAR Turkey **phone:** +90-533-395-5839 **fax:** +90-216-589-1616 **email:** info@irenec2012.com **www:** http://www.irenec2012.com

Policy Dialogue Asia Stakeholder Consultation: Policy Dialogue Asia stakeholder consultation will be held in July 2012. **dates:** 7-8 July 2012 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

19th Session of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) Council: The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will host the 19th Regular Session of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) Council. The Council will examine project and issues in three thematic clusters: healthy communities and ecosystems; climate change - low-carbon economy; and greening the economy in North America. **dates:** 10-11 July 2012 **location:** New Orleans, Louisiana, USA **contact:** Nathalie Daoust, Council Secretary **phone:** +514-350-4310 **fax:** +514-350-4314 **email:** ndaoust@cec.org **www:** <http://www.cec.org/council2012>

68th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The CDM Executive Board holds regular its meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. **dates:** 16-20 July 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** 49-228-815-1000 **fax:** 49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

Third Workshop on Enhancing the Regional Distribution of CDM Projects in Asia and the Pacific: This workshop is organized by the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) and the UNFCCC Secretariat, in collaboration with the UNEP Risoe Centre. The aim of the workshop is to provide a platform for participants to share best practices and key lessons, enhance their knowledge on the CDM and discuss technical, financial and policy issues specific to their projects. **dates:** 18-20 July 2012 **location:** Manila, Philippines **contact:** Alma Cañarejo **email:** acanarejo@cmp-adb.org **www:** http://mailman.ngocentre.org.vn/webfm_send/3358

Third meeting of the High-Level Panel on the CDM Policy Dialogue: The third meeting of the High-Level Panel on the CDM Policy Dialogue will be held at the end of July. **dates:** 25-26 July 2012 **location:** Johannesburg, South Africa **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

38th Meeting of the CDM Small Scale Working Group: The thirty-eighth meeting of the CDM Small Scale Working Group will be held in August. **dates:** 7-10 August 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

57th Meeting of the CDM Methodology Panel: The fifty-seventh meeting of the CDM Methodology Panel will take place in August. **dates:** 13-17 August 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

61st meeting of the CDM Accreditation Panel: The sixty-first meeting of the CDM Accreditation Panel will be held in late August. **dates:** 21-24 August 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany

contact: UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

Additional Session of the UNFCCC Ad Hoc Working Groups: This tentatively scheduled meeting will include sessions of the AWG-LCA, the AWG-KP and the ADP. Due to space limitations, it will not be possible to hold side events and exhibits on this occasion. **dates:** 30 August - 5 September 2012 (tentative) **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** <http://www.unfccc.int/>

Second Global Conference on Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change: The second Global Conference on Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change is co-organized by the Governments of Viet Nam and the Netherlands, in collaboration with other partners, including the World Bank and the FAO. The meeting will take stock of the implementation of the Roadmap for Action established at the 2010 conference in The Hague, the Netherlands, and set new and more concrete priorities for action while demonstrating early action on climate-smart agriculture as a driver for green growth. **dates:** 3-7 September 2012 **location:** Hanoi, Viet Nam **contact:** Tran Kim Long, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development **phone:** +84-4-38434682 **fax:** +84-4-37330752 **email:** longtk.htqt@mard.gov.vn **www:** <http://www.afconference.com/>

14th Regular Session of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment: The 14th Regular Session of the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN-14) will provide a platform for African Ministers to debate the key outcomes of the UNCSD (Rio+20), and address other emerging issues. The meeting will also provide an opportunity to the Ministers to refine their strategies in preparation for UNFCCC COP 18. **dates:** 10-14 September 2012 **location:** Arusha, Tanzania **contact:** Angele Luh Sy **phone:** +254-20-762-4292 **email:** Angele.Luh@unep.org **www:** <http://www.unep.org/roa/InformationMaterial/PressReleases/tabid/51641/Default.aspx>

Oceans of Potential Conference: The "Oceans of Potential" conference is an initiative of Plymouth's marine science organizations and coordinated by Plymouth Marine Laboratory. It will bring together stakeholders from a broad range of disciplines to discuss the opportunities offered by oceans, including renewable energy, carbon sequestration, human health, bioengineering and new approaches to food production. **dates:** 11-12 September 2012 **location:** Plymouth, United Kingdom **contact:** Conference Secretariat **email:** pde@plymouth.ac.uk **www:** www.oceansofpotential.org

CTI-CFF Regional Exchange: Climate Change Adaptation Experiences in the Coral Triangle: The Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF) is a multilateral partnership of six countries working together to sustain extraordinary marine and coastal resources by addressing crucial issues such as food security, climate change and marine biodiversity. This regional exchange aims to review and share the recent activities in the Coral Triangle countries related to vulnerability assessments and early actions towards resiliency and climate change adaptation learning networks. **date:** 12 September 2012 **location:** TBA **contact:** CTI-CFF Secretariat **phone:** +62-21-386-0623 **fax:** +62-21-386-0623

email: secretariat@cti-secretariat.net **www:** <http://www.coraltriangleinitiative.org/events/cti-cff-regional-exchange-cca-experiences-coral-triangle>

Nigeria Alternative Energy Expo: The Nigeria Alternative Energy Expo will bring together renewable energy and power professionals, government and civil society representatives, as well as over 200 exhibiting companies from all over the world. It aims to: create a platform for all stakeholders to network and transfer knowledge and skills; raise awareness and educate the public about climate change; and showcase both local and international initiatives and technologies that are at the forefront of renewable energy and climate change resilience. **dates:** 17-19 September 2012 **location:** Abuja, Nigeria **contact:** Conference Organizers **phone:** +234-9-480-6271 **email:** info@nigeriaalternativeenergyexpo.org **www:** <http://www.nigeriaalternativeenergyexpo.org/>

69th Meeting of the CDM Executive Board: The Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) will hold its 69th meeting to consider matters relating to the operation of the CDM. **dates:** 17-21 September 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

Third International Conference on De-growth for Ecological Sustainability and Social Equity: This conference will cover three topics—commons, work and democracy—and address the sources of de-growth, subjects of change and scenarios. **dates:** 19-23 September 2012 **location:** Venice, Italy **contact:** Conference Secretariat **email:** venezia2012decrecita.it **www:** <http://www.venezia2012.it/chi-siamo/promotori/?lang=en>

Third Symposium on the Ocean in a High-CO2 World: This symposium is sponsored by the Scientific Committee on Oceanographic Research (SCOR), the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO, and the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme. The symposium aims to attract over 300 of the world's leading scientists to discuss the impacts of ocean acidification on marine organisms, ecosystems and biogeochemical cycles. It will also cover socioeconomic consequences of ocean acidification, including policy and management implications. **dates:** 24-27 September 2012 **location:** Monterey, California, USA **email:** secretariat@scor-int.org **www:** <http://www.highco2-iii.org>

30th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee: The Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee will meet in September. **dates:** 26-28 September 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

22nd LEG meeting: The Least Developed Countries Expert Group will meet in late September 2012. **dates:** 26-29 September 2012 **location:** Funafuti, Tuvalu **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

UNU-WIDER Conference on Climate Change and Development Policy: The UN University (UNU)-World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER) conference on "Climate Change and Development Policy" aims to reflect

the diverse range of perspectives on how to balance climate and development objectives. The conference will evaluate how research can inform development policy and identify existing knowledge gaps, focusing on both low-carbon development (mitigation) and climate-resilient strategies (adaptation). **dates:** 28-29 September 2012 **location:** Helsinki, Finland **contact:** Anne Ruohonen **email:** climate2012@wider.unu.edu **www:** http://www.wider.unu.edu/home/news/en_GB/call-28-09-2012/

LEG workshop for Pacific LDCs: The LEG workshop for Pacific LDCs will be held in Tuvalu. **dates:** 28 September - 3 October 2012 **location:** Funafuti, Tuvalu **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

October CDM Meetings: The 8th CDM Assessment team workshop will be held from 1-2 October, the 39th meeting of the CDM small-scale working group will be held from 9-12 October, the 5th CDM roundtable will be held on 12 October, the 58th meeting of the CDM Methodology Panel will be held from 15-19 October, and the 62nd meeting of the CDM Accreditation Panel will be held from 22-25 October 2012. **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

African Sustainable Energy Finance Summer Academy: The Sustainable Energy Finance Academy, held within the new framework of the Frankfurt School – UNEP Collaborating Centre for Climate and Sustainable Energy Finance, will provide a comprehensive framework on renewable energy and energy efficiency financing in Nairobi, Kenya, with a special emphasis on renewable energy in Africa. **dates:** 21-26 October 2012 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **contact:** Summer Academy Team **phone:** +49-069-154008-692 **fax:** +49-069-154008-4692 **email:** summeracademy@fs.de **www:** http://www.frankfurt-school.de/content/en/consulting/ias/regional_summer_academies/sustainable_energy_finance_nairobi.html

Eighth African Development Forum: The eighth African Development Forum (ADF) is being held under the theme "Governing and Harnessing Natural Resources for Africa's Development." The ADF will focus on the following six areas: knowledge base, human and institutional capacities; policy, legal and regulatory issues; economic issues; governance, human rights and social issues; participation and ownership of natural resources; and environmental, material stewardship and climate change. **dates:** 23-25 October 2012 **location:** Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (tentative) **contact:** Isatou Gaye **phone:** +251-11-544-5098 **fax:** +251-11-551-0365 **email:** igaye@uneca.org **www:** http://www.uneca.org/eca_resources/news/2012/120309adf.html

29th Meeting of the Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel: The Joint Implementation Accreditation Panel will meet in October 2012. **dates:** 24-25 October 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

19th Meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board: The Adaptation Fund Board will meet in October. **dates:** 25-26 October 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** Marcia Levaggi **phone:** +1-202-473-6390 **email:** mlevaggi@thegef.org **www:** <http://www.adaptation-fund.org/page/calendar>

37th Meeting of the CDM Afforestation and Reforestation

Working Group: The 37th Meeting of the CDM Afforestation and Reforestation Working Group will be held in late October. **dates:** 29-31 October 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

CIF Partnership Forum 2012 and Associated Events:

The Climate Investment Funds Partnership Forum is an annual gathering of all stakeholders interested in the development of the CIF, to review work done and discuss further areas for action.

dates: 31 October - 8 November 2012 **location:** Istanbul, Turkey **contact:** Climate Investment Funds **phone:** +1-202-458-1801 **email:** CIFAdminUnit@worldbank.org **www:** <http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/>

World Energy Outlook 2012 Launch:

The International Energy Agency (IEA) will launch its flagship publication, the World Energy Outlook (WEO) 2012. The WEO-2012 will include analysis and insights into global energy market trends and their meaning for energy security, environmental protection and economic development. It will also contain updated forecasts to 2035 of energy production and demand, investment, trade and emissions, broken down by country, fuel and sector. The WEO-2012 will also investigate specific strategic energy issues, including: "golden rules" for the coming "Golden Age of Gas," an in-depth examination of the value of improving energy efficiency; the increasing importance of the water-energy nexus; climate feedbacks on energy trends; and the International Year of Sustainable Energy for All. **date:** 12 November 2012 **location:** Paris, France **contact:** Pawel Olejarnik, IEA **phone:** +33-1-40-57-67-57 **email:** pawel.olejarnik@iea.org **www:** <http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/publications/weo-2012/>

6th CDM Roundtable and 70th Meeting of the CDM

Executive Board: The 6th CDM Roundtable will be held on 18 November, followed by the 70th meeting of the CDM Executive Board. The meeting precedes UNFCCC COP 18/CMP 8. **dates:** 18-23 November 2012 **location:** Bonn, Germany **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

14th meeting of the CDM DNA Forum: The 14th meeting of the CDM Designated National Authorities (DNA) Forum will be held in late November. **dates:** 24 -25 November 2012 **location:** Doha, Qatar **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

UNFCCC COP 18: The 18th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 18) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the eighth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 8), among other associated meetings, are scheduled to take place in Doha, Qatar. **dates:** 26 November - 7 December 2012 **location:** Doha, Qatar **contact:** UNFCCC Secretariat **phone:** +49-228-815-1000 **fax:** +49-228-815-1999 **email:** secretariat@unfccc.int **www:** http://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/2655.php

GLOSSARY

ADP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
AAU	Assigned Amount Unit
ALBA	Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
AWG-KP	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol
AWG-LCA	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention
BASIC	Brazil, South Africa, India and China
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
COP	Conference of the Parties
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre and Network
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GRULAC	Group of Latin American and Caribbean States
EIG	Environmental Integrity Group
EITs	Economies in Transition
ICA	International Consultation and Analysis
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IPRs	Intellectual Property Rights
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LEG	Least Developed Countries Expert Group
LULUCF	Land use, land-use change and forestry
MRV	Measuring, reporting and verification
NWP	Nairobi Work Programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation
NAMA	Nationally appropriate mitigation actions
NAPs	National adaptation plans
NAPA	National adaptation programme of action
QELROS	Quantified Emissions Limitation and Reduction Commitments
REDD+	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries
SBs	Subsidiary Bodies
SBI	Subsidiary Body for Implementation
SBSTA	Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice
SICA	Central American Integration System
TEC	Technology Executive Committee
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
YOUNGOs	Youth NGOs